1	REPORTER'S RECORD
2	VOLUME 1 OF 1 VOLUME TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. 2011-76724
3	
4	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS, * IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF Plaintiff, and THE STATE OF *
5	TEXAS, acting by and through * The TEXAS COMMISSION ON *
6	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, a * Necessary and indispensable *
7	Party *
8	v. * HARRIS COUNTY, T E X A S
9	INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY, * MCGINNES INDUSTRIAL *
10	MAINTENANCE CORPORATION, * WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC., AND *
11	WASTE MANAGEMENT OF TEXAS, * INC., Defendants. * 295TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
12	
13	REPORTER'S RECORD
14	DAILY COPY
15	OCTOBER 16, 2014
16	
17	On the 16th day of October 2014 the trial came on
17 18	On the 16th day of October, 2014, the trial came on to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause;
17 18 19	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in
17 18 19 20	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:
17 18 19 20 21	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:  Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype machine; Reporter's Record produced by computer-assisted
17 18 19 20	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:  Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype
17 18 19 20 21 22	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:  Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype machine; Reporter's Record produced by computer-assisted
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to be heard in the above-entitled and -numbered cause; and the following proceedings were had before the Honorable Caroline Baker, Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, Texas:  Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype machine; Reporter's Record produced by computer-assisted

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF, HARRIS COUNTY:
4	
5	CONNELLY BAKER WOTRING, LLP 700 JPMORGAN CHASE TOWER
6	600 TRAVIS STREET HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.980.1713
7	
8	BY: MR. EARNEST W. WOTRING MS. DEBRA TSUCHIYAMA BAKER MR. DAVID GEORGE MR. JOHN MUIR
10	- AND -
11	THE OFFICE OF VINCE RYAN
12	COUNTY ATTORNEY 1019 CONGRESS, 15TH FLOOR
13	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.755.7880
14	BY: MR. ROCK OWENS FIRST ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY
15	TIROT AGGICTANT GOONTT ATTORNET
16	
17	COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF, THE STATE OF TEXAS:
18	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION
19	P.O. BOX 12548, CAPITOL STATION AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2548
20	PHONE: 512-463.2012
21	BY: MR. ANTHONY W. BENEDICT MS. LINDA B. SECORD
22	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	
4	COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.
5	AND WASTE MANAGEMENT OF TEXAS, INC.:
6	GIBBS & BRUNS, LLP  1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 5300
7	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.650.8805
8	BY: MR. BARRETT H. REASONER MR. ROBIN GIBBS
9	MR. MARK GIUGLIANO
10	MR. ANTHONY KAIM MS. SYDNEY BALLESTEROS MR. COLIN POGGE
11	MR. BRIAN T. ROSS
12	
13	
13 14	COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY:
	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
14	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
14 15	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000
14 15 16	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD
14 15 16 17	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000 BY: MR. WINN CARTER
14 15 16 17	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES
14 15 16 17 18	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
14 15 16 17 18 19	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306 PHONE: 202.955.8500
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP 1000 LOUISIANA STREET, SUITE 4000 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002 PHONE: 713.890.5000  BY: MR. WINN CARTER MR. CRAIG A. STANFIELD MR. CHRIS AMANDES MR. DAVID SCHRADER  - AND -  GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306 PHONE: 202.955.8500

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	COUNCEL FOR REFERENCE
4	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT, MCGINNES INDUSTRIAL MAINTENANCE CORP.:
5	
6	WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP 1111 LOUISIANA STREET, 25TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002-5242
7	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002-5242 PHONE: 713.651.2663
8	BY: MS. PAULA W. HINTON
9	MS. MELANIE GRAY
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
-	

## OCTOBER 16, 2014

(Jury Present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

opening statements.

Good morning again, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm going to read you additional instructions which

apply now that you are on the jury. I'm going to read

in some stipulations, and then we will proceed with

(After the jury instructions were read by the Court, the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Does everyone understand these instructions? If you do not, please tell me now.

All right. Let me go through what we're going to be doing so we have an idea of the process. As we talked about at the beginning of the voir dire, this is a civil case that's tried to a jury. In a civil case the plaintiff has the burden of proof, so the plaintiff will go first. The plaintiff will make an opening statement and then the defendants, if they so choose, will make opening statements. Then the plaintiff puts on their evidence, then the defendants put on their evidence.

Then we do something outside your presence that's called the Charge conference. Really, all that

is is the attorneys and the Judge get together and decisions are made as to what questions are going to be submitted to you for you to answer, and they're all written up in a document called the Court's Charge.

We give each of you a copy of that document when we bring you back in the courtroom, and I read through that entire document with you. It will have additional instructions, some definitions and the actual questions you are going to answer as jurors. At that time we proceed to closing arguments.

The plaintiffs go first, then the defendants, then the plaintiff, because they have the burden of proof, has a rebuttal argument, the last say, so to speak. It's after that time that you are sent to the jury room to begin deliberating on the questions. You'll select a presiding juror, deliberate on the questions, fill in your answers and come into court with your verdict. That's typically how these cases go.

From time to time you may see the attorneys object. Sometimes they may ask to approach the bench, sometimes we may go out in the hallway. Sometimes we may send you into the jury room while we deal with something outside your presence. First of all, please do not hold that against any of these attorneys; that's parts of their job as advocates. These are things for

the record. It doesn't have anything to do with you, and I don't want you to be annoyed or irritated or hold that against them when they do their job. Everybody comfortable with that?

Also, I may have mentioned this before. While I think the technology in this courtroom is wonderful, there's one piece of the technology I don't particularly like. There is a button I could push that would put white noise over your head and we can have conferences up at the bench. I think it's obnoxious, because you just sit there and listen to noise while we sit up here at the bench and talk. I think you would probably rather be in the jury room, it's more comfortable, while we take care of our business in here. Please understand that's what I'm doing when I send you out into the jury room and know that we're in here working, not keeping you waiting. Does everybody understand those instructions?

Okay. Here is the most important instruction I can give you. The reason our system works as well as it does is because we have people like you sitting on juries, making the decisions in these cases. You, as jurors, are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be given the evidence.

Sometimes when people haven't been through this process before, maybe they're a little nervous, may have some other reason, they might have a tendency to look to the Judge to see how they should react to the evidence. That is not okay. First of all, it's irrelevant what I think.

I'm here simply to administer the law. You will see me doing some other things, because I'm presiding over other cases while I'm presiding over this trial, and I may be signing orders and things. I have an expressive face. I might be reacting to something that has nothing do with this lawsuit. It's not fair to these fine attorneys and their clients for you to look to anyone else, including me, to decide what you think about the evidence. I need to make sure that every juror is comfortable making the commitment that you will decide for yourselves what you think about the evidence in this case.

Is everybody comfortable making that commitment?

THE JURY: Yes.

THE COURT: Does anybody have any questions about the process, as I've described it?

All right. Then at this time, I'm going to read to you two stipulations. These are -- a

stipulation is simply an agreement of something that's not going to be litigated in this case; it's not going to be in dispute in this case, and so I'm going to read these into evidence and then we will move on to the opening statements. All right.

"In March 2008, the US Environmental Protection Agency listed the site at issue in this suit as a federal Superfund site. Since 2008 the EPA has been overseeing the environmental investigation, removal and remediation of the site that is being performed or paid for by the defendants, as required by federal law. That process is ongoing and will result in the EPA selecting a method for permanently cleaning up the site.

"Participating in the Superfund process has no bearing on whether a party is liable under the Texas statutes claimed in this lawsuit. The lawsuit you are here about is separate and independent of the EPA's Superfund process. If any penalty payments are assessed in this lawsuit, the money will not be for the ongoing site remediation or ultimate cleanup. Any such money will be paid into the Harris County General Fund and the State of Texas General Revenue Fund. The money can be used for any lawful purpose by Harris County and the State of Texas.

"In July, 1985, the EPA listed dioxin as a

hazardous substance. As a result of its determination that dioxin may be harmful to the public health or the environment, the EPA listed the site as a Superfund site in 2008, due to the presence of dioxin. The fact that the EPA designated the site as a Superfund site is not a factor for you to consider in this case in determining whether any Texas statute has been violated."

Does everybody understand the stipulation?

All right. With that, we will proceed with opening statements. Mr. Wotring.

MR. WOTRING: Good morning.

## **OPENING STATEMENTS**

## BY MR. WOTRING

Here is where we are: This is the -- not probably -- this is the last time I will be able to address you-all directly about what Harris County believes the evidence will be in this case. So believe it or not, this is supposed to be a brief thumbnail sketch of the evidence, and this is a lawyer's idea of a brief thumbnail sketch of the evidence.

It won't be the last time you-all get to hear the evidence because this is not evidence. This is an introduction to the evidence, kind of to set the framework for what we think the evidence is and what the evidence will be when you hear the witnesses from the

stand.

So we've obviously spent a lot of time on this case. We have obviously put together a lot of documents, and you're going to be hearing that over the next few weeks as we put it on in front of you. This is an introduction to that evidence.

So, first, we thought we would identify for you where the site is that we've been talking about. And the site is just north of the I-10 bridge where we have the pen marked "waste pit." If you drive east from here, you are going to pass it on your left; and that's the aerial photograph of the site. And it is located approximately 3 1/4 miles from the San Jacinto Monument, if that helps you identify where this site is.

And that's the first aerial photograph of the site that you are going to see. From time to time, different agencies and different companies take aerial photographs of pretty much everything, and you can go back and look at the aerial photographs if you know what you're looking for.

So here are the parties to this action.

It's Harris County -- Harris County is different than
the City. Harris County is different than the State.

And there are different types of agencies in the County;
but we represent Harris County, itself.

And here today on behalf of Harris County, number one, is Vince Ryan. This is the County Attorney. He's an elected official. We also have with us Commissioner Jack Cagle from Precinct 4. The County government has four different precincts and one county Now, that county judge is not like this district It's the chief person in charge of the County iudae. government. So Commissioner Cagle is one of the four; there are three other commissioners who are all attending other business and functions today.

We also have with us today Bob Allen. He's a director of Pollution Control Services at Harris County. Mr. Allen will probably be attending a good portion of the trial as Harris County's representative. And I think I've already introduced Mr. Rock Owens, who is the chief environmental lawyer for Harris County, and Terry O'Rourke, who is one of the special assistants to Vince Ryan as a county attorney. So that's Harris County. We also have the State of Texas here. You'll be hearing from Mr. Bennett. He represents the State of Texas and he can address you directly about how he handles that.

Then, of course, we have the defendants, and the defendants in this case are International Paper. We have Champion Paper, which is the historic entity

that you'll be hearing about. Champion merged with International Paper in 2000; the two companies merged together, and you'll hear evidence about what that means.

Then you have Waste Management as a company and you have McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation. And we're going to have to talk about the corporate chain of ownership between McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation and Waste Management.

And what you heard in voir dire is that these companies -- International Paper's attorney told you these companies touch every product or are involved in products from cups to diapers, and that they are in your community and they have facilities around you. And you heard from the Waste Management attorney that they have facilities around you, and you heard something about that from the panel members.

These are companies that are around us. Waste Management is headquartered in this county, and that's where its main base of operations is, from the corporate side.

Briefly put, and as briefly put as I could do it, here is a thumbnail sketch of the case: Champion put its paper mill sludge in the San Jacinto River waste pits. Harris County told them not to let the waste get

into the river, okay. Let me show you two documents and we'll talk about them later. You'll see these documents too many times from me and everybody else. There are two documents that I want to show you, and then we'll talk about them.

There are two letters -- we'll read them all in a minute. There is a letter dated June 11th, 1965, and there is a letter of May 25th, 1965. We'll read them out word-for-word, and that's probably the last time I'm going to do that in this case, because I think you-all only need to see it one time.

So Harris County told them not to let the waste get into the river, and then Champion and MIMC left their sludge in the waste pits and abandoned them for 40 years. You've heard from the Judge the stipulation that the parties agreed to, that in 1985 the EPA determined that dioxin was hazardous. In the 1980s Champion and MIMC knew the paper mill sludge that they had generated -- that Champion had generated and that MIMC had transported and had placed into the pits had dioxin in it. And from 1985 forward, it was known that the sludge containing dioxin was hazardous to people and/or the environment.

Defendants didn't warn anyone about the hazardous dioxin in their sludge. And you'll hear more

about different defendants were involved at different times with the pits and the sludge, and we'll walk through that later in the presentation.

Defendants did nothing to stop their sludge laced with dioxin from getting into the river, and as a result, under the Texas law, defendants are responsible for the daily pollution of the San Jacinto River with paper mill sludge containing the hazardous substance, dioxin.

One of the laws that you're going to be asked to look at is the Texas Water Code, and I have boiled it down. This is not the exact terms, but that law boiled down says "If you cause, suffer, allow or permit the pollution of the waters of the State of Texas," you must pay a penalty.

It is not about whether you own the property. It is not about whether -- it's not only about whether you own the property. It's not about whether you only generated the sludge. It is about whether you caused, suffer, allow or permit the pollution of the waters of the State of Texas.

If that's the case, then you must pay a penalty, and the penalty range is from \$50 a day to \$25,000 a day. Now, because of the period of time we're talking about, there are different maximums for

different periods of time. So early in the period it may be \$50 to a thousand dollars, but in the later period -- and we'll give you the specific information through a witness -- it goes up to \$25,000 a day.

And what we've put up here, briefly, is this case is not about putting the paper mill sludge in the impoundments at the beginning. This case is about letting it get into the water for 35 years of violation. And I'm putting this calendar of all those years as a reminder of that fact. It is just a sad fact of this case that most of the documents we have are from early in the period of time, but that shouldn't -- I don't want that to detract from the fact this is about 35 years of violations, not the early period of time. That sets the stage for the rest of the facts you'll hear about.

Here is an aerial photo in 1964, and you can see the bridge. I'm going to have to ask my -- you can see the bridge. This is Highway 73, and later it becomes I-10. Just north of that is the land and the tract; you see it right next to the river. I think at the time they described it as being in a low, marshy area near the river. So before they put the pits there, they put them in a low, marshy area near the river.

And here is the timeline: Champion hired a

company called Ole Peterson to barge its paper mill waste to the San Jacinto pits we're talking about. Harris County agreed that Champion could put the waste in the pits; however, Champion was expressly warned by Dr. Quebedeaux of the Harris County Health Unit that the waste-handling operation should be done in a manner which would not allow any waste to leave the property and escape into the river.

Now I want to go into the two letters that I talked about. The May 25th letter is from Dr. Quebedeaux. Dr. Quebedeaux was, if not the first, one of the first Harris County Pollution Control Directors. I think he's about three guys before Mr. Allen here. And he was -- well, you'll hear more about him, but he was the Harris County Pollution Control director and they did approach him and ask him his opinion about putting the sludge pits in the river.

And he said -- and there are two paragraphs to this letter. He said, "The location of the proposed spoil pond," which we viewed yesterday, "seems to be ideal for the purpose for which you intend to use it. This is partially -- or particularly so, since the bottom and sides or dikes are composed of clay, which should render it practically impossible for seepage to escape and enter into the San Jacinto River." And then

there is a second paragraph of this letter.

"I would like to remind you, again, that your waste handling operation should be done in a manner which would not allow any liquid waste to leave the property and escape into the river. We believe this could be done easily, but of necessity would require some careful handling."

There is paragraph one and there is paragraph two. And I don't believe you can fairly show this letter or talk about this letter without talking about paragraph one and paragraph two at the same time.

Now, the company went back to him and wanted a more particular letter, and so that's the next one I want to show you. And it's almost the same, except it specifies the location of the spoil pond. This is June 11th, just a few weeks later.

Again, the first paragraph is the same. This is the last time -- I promise, I'll try to make it the last time I read this thing out loud to you. "The location of the proposed spoil pond, which is located on the west bank of the San Jacinto River, just north of the Highway 73 bridge, seems to be ideal for the purpose for which you intend to use it. This is particularly so since the bottom and sides, or dikes, are composed of clay, which should render it practically impossible for

seepage to escape and enter into the San Jacinto River."

And then we have Paragraph 2. "I would like to remind you again that your waste-handling operation should be done in a manner which would not allow any liquid waste to leave the property and escape into the river. We believe this could be done easily, but of necessity would require some careful handling."

I don't think we have a much better copy.

Maybe when you scoot it down it gets a little bit
better.

I was trying to figure out how to explain to you that because of this letter, obviously it's an important exhibit in the case, but I don't think you can talk about the letter without talking about paragraph one and paragraph two. I was going to say it's like peanut butter and jelly, but it's not like a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. You can have a peanut butter sandwich; you can have a jelly sandwich, and you can't have this letter without having both paragraphs, so it's more like a Reese's Cup. You can't have a Reese's Cup without having the peanut butter and the chocolate. So if you are talking about this letter with one paragraph and not the other, then you're talking about a Reese's Cup without something that makes a Reese's Cup a Reese's Cup. So you are going to hear about this letter some

more.

And, again, I want to go back to the fact that this case is not about putting it in the site.

It's about what happened after and the failure to maintain and look after the sludge for the next 35 years. And we'll talk about that time frame.

Okay. That's the two letters, the June 11th letter and the earlier May 25th, 1965, letter.

Pretty soon in this case I think we're all going to be able to tell by your eyes that we don't need to read those letters any more, but I don't think we're quite there yet, so we'll probably hear a little bit more and I'll probably overuse those letters. But hopefully I'll get to the point and move on.

Okay. So that's the two letters. Champion entered into a contract with Ole Peterson to remove the sludge and to send it to the site. And that contract had some specific terms; it had a lot of terms. We've excerpted some out; that's not the complete contract.

And one was that they were going to transport the sludge off site to land acceptable to Champion. Champion -- that contract required the contractor, his employees, subcontractors and agents, to adhere in all respects with Champion's operating and safety codes and regulations. Under the contract all

waste disposal work was subject to coordination and inspection by Champion's designated representative. And Champion's contract provided that Champion's representative had complete access for the inspection of the work and material and equipment. And that contract ran by its terms through 1971.

We talked about those two letters. I'm not going to read them.

Now, what happened, and I think the evidence will come in, is that Ole Peterson ran into some problems with the IRS shortly after starting the contract. And so Champion found MIMC, which was formed by Virgil McGinnis and his brother shortly before taking over this contract, and then MIMC assumed the contract from Ole Peterson, and then MIMC started barging the waste to the San Jacinto pits.

Now, in December of '65 -- so we're kind of starting roughly in June of '65 and moving on toward the end of that year -- Dr. Quebedeaux visited the waste pits and he reminded Champion and MIMC that the approval to use the ponds and the San Jacinto River was only under the condition that the waste-handling operation should be done in a manner which would not allow any liquid waste to leave the property and escape into the river.

And then in response, Champion, to that visit, Champion did an internal memo, and I think we've got that excerpted. What they said is, "I am sure we all realize the sensitive nature of this entire operation and the need for special precautions with the disposal of this waste material."

There is his letter of December 28th, 1965, and there are portions marked out as a result of --

THE COURT: Probably the easiest thing for me to do at this time is to let you know there are documents you will see that will have blacked-out portions. Those are as a result of rulings by the Court.

MR. WOTRING: So that has the language in it. The first paragraph is very similar to the first paragraph of these two letters here, very similar to this language again.

What it says there is -- the bottom portion is what you have in focus.

He tells you "the dikes which are being used to contain the wastes should be repaired." So the bottom of that says -- we'll read the whole thing and then I won't have to do it again.

"On June 11th, 1965 a letter was written to Burma Engineering in which the use of the property

located on the west bank of the San Jacinto River, just north of Highway 73 bridge, as a spoil pond for waste removal from the Champion company was approved. This approval was only under the condition that the 'waste handling operations be done in a manner which would not allow any liquid waste to leave the property and escape into the river.'"

And then he says "On December 27th, 1965 at 5:15 p.m." -- and then we move on down, "At the time given above, the superintendent, Mr. Ned Chesser, was notified, since I could not contact anyone at your office" -- this is the letter to MIMC -- "Mr. Chesser was asked to communicate to you the information that within the next 24 hours that the dikes which are being used to contain the wastes should be repaired." And that is the December 28th letter.

And then we have what Champion did in response to that. So Dr. Quebedeaux writes to MIMC, and Champion takes action because Champion had sufficient control and interest in this sludge that they wanted to follow up on. There is going to be a dispute, I think, between the defendants. We'll see what they have to say about who owned the sludge after it was given from Champion to MIMC.

Either way, from Harris County's

perspective and on the law, the language "cause, suffer, allow" doesn't require anybody to own the sludge; they just have to have the power to stop the sludge from getting into the river.

And this is what Champion said in the December 30th, 1965, memorandum; and I think these are already in evidence.

Bryan, would you mind blowing up that portion there? And scrolling down? Bryan and I have been working together a long time.

It says, "Attached are a copy of a letter dated December 28, 1965, relating to the disposal of Champion's -- Champion's waste sludge material." And then he says also -- the private memorandum says, "Also, in a telephone conversation with Bob Roderick and subsequent discussion with representatives of MIMC Corporation, Dr. Quebedeaux pointed out the need for levee repairs as follows."

Okay. Here is why this is important, because later on we're going to get into the fact that these -- these pits became submerged under the waters of the San Jacinto River. And what this document shows is the levees were nothing more than silt and sand with a little bit of clay in them, and that as a result of the way they were built and as a result of the failure to

maintain them or go back out to the site, the waste paper mill sludge containing dioxin got out every day.

And this is one of the few pieces of information we have about what actually the levees were made of.

If we scroll back up -- and that's the end of the memo. I know sometimes the whole document is into evidence, except some portions that have been taken out, and you'll have a chance to see the whole document and to put it in context. And I want to point out the bottom paragraph for you. It says that, "I am sure we all realize the sensitive nature of this entire operation and the need for special precaution in connection with the disposal of this waste material."

At the time, they knew that they needed -that there was a sensitive nature of the operation and
they needed to take special precaution in connection
with the disposal of the waste material. That's what
they knew at the time. That's what they put in their
internal memo.

In May, the State Department of Health investigated Champion's waste disposal practice at the site and they identified seepage and problems with the levees. It's a very long document. There is a lot of information in it, and for -- it talks about whether the dikes would be subject to flooding; it talks about

whether they would be affected by storms. And that is another one of the documents you're going to hear about in this case.

And then July 14th, 1966, Champion had its own internal documents which showed that it knew that it was polluting the San Jacinto River site, but it did not tell the public or the government about that fact. The exact quote, and I'll put the document up in a minute, is, "Champion told its management that 'because of the pollution problem, it is impractical to consider further dumping at the present location on the San Jacinto River.'"

Here is that document, and that's the quote pulled out from it. That's an internal Champion document from July 14th of 1966, which says, "Because of the pollution problem, it is impractical to consider further dumping at the present location on the San Jacinto River."

So if I go back, what we know -- what they knew at the time was, "We all realize the sensitive nature of this entire operation and the need for special precaution in connection with the disposal of this waste material." And then July 14th, 1966, it states, their memo states, "Because of the pollution problem, it is impractical to consider further dumping at the present

location on the San Jacinto River."

I don't believe there will be any evidence that any action was taken in response to this memorandum by Champion. I don't believe there will be any evidence in this case admitted that Champion informed anybody at Harris County that they knew they had a pollution problem at the site on the San Jacinto River. I don't believe there will be any evidence that Champion did any follow-up as a result of this memorandum to do anything about the pollution problems they identified in their internal document on July 14th, 1966.

That's the pits as of 1966. So here is the river (indicating) and here is the highway bridge, and here they are outlined. Let me take a brief moment to describe the pits to you and something else about this case.

We believe there are three pits. Here is one pit. Here is another pit (indicating).

Bryan, can you blow that up? Thank you.

And here is a third pit (indicating). And that for different periods of time, each one of those pits was releasing into the San Jacinto River and there should be a penalty assessed for each pit. They built the site up to contain their paper mill sludge, the sludge that they produced by the tens of thousands of

cubic yards each year. They needed a place to put it so they could keep their mill operating; and they should pay a penalty for the expanding operations at this site for each one of the three pits.

MIMC got paid by how much sludge they sent to the site. They sent it to three different pits, we believe the evidence will show; and that as a result, they are also liable for three different penalties per day.

Now, we're going to get to Waste Management and Waste Management's connection with this case, so we're not forgetting about them. That is just a little bit later in the presentation.

That's the close-up of the pits. So now we're going back -- we're going forward. The last date was July 14th, 1966. Now we're moving two years ahead, two years ahead; and MIMC convened a board of directors meeting and voted to abandon the waste pit site, and they paid themselves a bonus. So this document is a board of directors minutes. And I wasn't too familiar with these types of documents before -- before this current job. This is a way a company makes a decision.

A company is an entity, and it has to make decisions and it has to record its decisions. So when the board of directors get together, it's like the brain

of the company getting together, and this is a record of what the company decided to do.

So you can see it's August 19th, 1968, is the date. This whole document is in evidence. There are excerpts. So one of the things they did on August 19th of 1968, was they give themselves a bonus. It looks like a significant sum of money now. I'm sure it was a much more significant sum of money in August of 1968.

And then they did something else, and this is the record of what they did. It said, "Discussion then turned to certain real estate owned by the corporation on the San Jacinto River, which was used during fiscal 1966 and part of fiscal 1967 as a dump for waste materials hauled by the corporation."

The chairman stated that during a conference with the corporation's auditors the physical status of the property was discussed. It was pointed out that the property was completely filled with waste materials and could no longer serve as a dump site. In other words, "We can't make any more money from this site, because it's full." They didn't quite say it like that. They said, "Due to its physical condition it was also regarded that the land was worthless in that it had no present sales value."

And, "Because of these factors, the corporation's auditors were instructed to eliminate the land as an asset of the corporation's books and records by writing down its stated book value from \$50,000 cost to the nominal sum of \$1. This action would be reflected in the corporation's balance sheet as of August 31, 1968."

"Based upon the foregoing -- "Based on the foregoing and upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, it was" -- and here is what they resolved to do. This is what the company decided to do, "that the real estate owned by this corporation on the San Jacinto River, previously used as a dump site in connection with corporate hauling activities, be abandoned as a dump site."

They had been told by Dr. Quebedeaux in those two letters and in December that they should conduct their operations so as to not let the liquid waste leave the site, and here they are in August of 1968 abandoning the site. And I don't believe you'll hear any evidence that they went back to the site after 1968, that they maintained it, that they inspected it, that they did anything to prevent it from going under the waters of the San Jacinto River, with the waste paper mill sludge that they had been paid to place

there.

Now, the land, itself, appears to have been in the title of Virgil McGinnis, one of the shareholders of the company. He had a deed, and it said it was in trust. It doesn't say who it was in trust for, but the record title says it's in the name of Virgil McGinnis. But these are the company records. Virgil McGinnis' company records showing that it was owned by the corporation and the corporation certainly had access and control over that property.

Here is the site in 1970 (indicating). This is the site where they placed the paper mill sludge, and in 1970 it's underwater. And I don't believe you're going to hear any evidence that anybody went out to maintain it, to inspect it, to make sure that the paper mill sludge stayed out of the waters of the San Jacinto River.

Again, these aerial photographs are taken of the entire area; they're not particularized on this area. After things started on this site, people went back and found the aerial photographs; but you can find aerial photographs of almost the whole Gulf Coast for different periods of time. So nobody was looking in the 1970s at these pits. We went back later and found the aerial photographs, and here they are. It's underwater.

So from 1968 to 1992, we don't believe MIMC or Champion did tell the public or the government that they had intentionally abandoned the pits full of hazardous waste by the San Jacinto River.

You've heard the stipulation of the parties, the statement that they agreed to, agreed to, that the EPA listed dioxin as a hazardous substance in July of 1985.

And then in March of 1988, the EPA now, the EPA did a study on paper mill sludge in conjunction with the industry, and they found that the paper bleaching process was responsible for the formation of dioxins in the effluent. Effluent in this case means water and sludge.

So the companies didn't go back at any time and determine what was in the sludge that they were producing by the cubic yard, by the tens of thousands, each year. The EPA did a study in conjunction with the industry, and in March of 1988 they issued the 5 Mill Study confirming that the pulp-bleaching process was responsible for the formation of dioxins. That's where we are in our period of time on the daily releases, 1988.

Now, after 1988, Champion didn't go back and say, "Wait a minute, we've got this study from the

EPA and it shows we have dioxin in our sludge, we should go back and find out if we have a sludge pit on the San Jacinto River, like we know we do, and do something about it."

I don't think there is any evidence, and I don't believe it happened, that Champion went back and did anything with the sludge pits after the 5 Mill Study and after the follow-up study, which is called the 104 Mill Study. That's the 104 Mill Study which came out after the 5 Mill Study in the 1988/89 time period.

Now, I'm shifting back a little bit to MIMC. MIMC had been in operation from the formation prior to 1965, and by 1992 it decided to sell itself to a company called GCE. There are a few more companies I'm afraid I have to talk about. There is no way around it, but it won't be the last time we're able to put this evidence in front of you.

So MIMC decided to sell itself to a company called GCE, and then it disclosed in writing to the people it wanted to sell itself to -- kind of like when you are selling your house you would be disclosing on the form a problem with your house so the buyer would know about it -- MIMC disclosed in writing, to its owners that it disposed of waste in the pits and that sale was worth millions of dollars.

And this is that disclosure letter. It's to a man called Tom Fatjo at GC Environmental. The date is January 30th, 1992. And this language, I'm going to sum it for you, it says what it says. This is in evidence. "These are what we're disclosing, pursuant to our agreement to disclose to you material facts about our company prior to receiving the purchase price for our company." It's signed by Lawrence McGinnis and Virgil McGinnis and Billie Doris McGinnis, the shareholders of McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation, or the owners.

And what they disclosed to GCE in 1992 was this paragraph that "The Company owns land adjacent to the San Jacinto River and Interstate 10 which, at one point was used for certain of the waste disposal activities of the Company."

They didn't forget that they owned this land. They didn't forget they had operations on this land, and they didn't forget what they did with it.

In fact, when they were going to get millions of dollars for selling their company, they wanted to make sure the buyer knew about it and they disclosed that up front, but they didn't tell anybody else.

And they also knew something else about

this land, and here's what they said: "With respect to such land, the Company has received no notice regarding a pending or threatened liability or administrative action under any Environmental Laws and, accordingly, no liability has been accrued on our Audited Financial Statements or the Interim Pro Forma Financial Statements therefor. It should however be noted that due to the expansive nature of Environmental Laws, the Company may at some point incur a liability under the Environmental Laws with respect to such land."

They haven't forgotten about the land. They knew that "due to the expansive nature of the Environmental Laws," the Company could at some point incur a liability under the Environmental Laws with respect to the land. And this is in 1992.

You're not going to hear any evidence in this case that MIMC went back to the site in 1993 or '94 or '95, or on through the end of the penalty period in March of 2008, to do anything with respect to this land. They didn't inspect it. They didn't maintain it. They didn't warn anybody about it. They didn't do anything about it.

Again, I'm putting this up as a pictorial reminder that this case is not about putting it in the pits. That sets the stage factually for what we're

talking about. This is about the daily release of sludge containing dioxin during all those years, and I'm excerpting out '91 and '92 because that's when they were selling their company, that's when they were writing letters to the buyer, and that's when they were getting millions of dollars for it.

So we're putting information in different forms. Some people like it written down on a page.

Some people like pictures. Some people like it both ways. What they tell us is, different people assimilate information differently. We've got a picture here.

MIMC was incorporated in 1965. And it's the -- MIMC, it's an interesting name -- McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation. Then it was -- the stock, the stock, was purchased by GC Environmental in 1992. And then GCE Environmental was purchased by Waste Management in January of 2003. And then GCE Environmental merged with Waste Management of Texas in December of 2003.

There is no more GC Environmental to sue.

GCE Environmental, as of 1992, had a hundred percent ownership of the stock of MIMC, and with that had a hundred percent control over MIMC, and could have and should have stopped the ongoing releases of dioxin from the San Jacinto River during that entire period of time.

And then when they merged into Waste Management of Texas, Waste Management of Texas had a hundred percent ownership of the stock of MIMC and could have and should have stopped the ongoing releases from 2003 through 2008.

What the evidence is going to show in this case is that as of 1994, MIMC had no employees, no revenue, and no operations. It was sold for millions of dollars, and two years later there is no employees, no revenues, and no operations. Different periods of time -- and we'll put the evidence on -- the directors of MIMC and the directors of Waste Management of Texas were identical. The officers of MIMC and the officers of Waste Management of Texas have been identical at different periods of time.

And currently, MIMC has no chief operating officer, no chief executive officer, no income and no separate offices from Waste Management of Texas. It truly is a mimic.

A different timeline, different set of companies. In 2001, International Paper merged Champion into it. And what you are going to hear from the evidence in this case is, and that I think was touched upon by counsel for International Paper was, that deal went so fast, they didn't do any due diligence. They

wanted to merge with that company so much that they didn't do any due diligence to look into where and what Champion had placed in the sludge pits on the San Jacinto River.

And I think you're going to hear their attorney say, "Well, we didn't know." Well, if you buy a company and you buy another paper company and you're a paper company that touches products all around us, from products of everything that comes into us, that comes out of us, then you should know that, if you are buying another paper company, about the sludge pits that you are purchasing as part of that company.

So this timeline starts because in 2005, Texas State officials identified astronomically high levels of dioxin in the San Jacinto River by the I-10 bridge. By that point, dioxin had already been declared as a hazardous substance in 1985 by the EPA. And then as a result of its determination that dioxin may be harmful to the public health of the environment, the EPA listed this site as a Superfund site due to the presence of dioxin in 2008, shortly before the end of the penalty period. The penalty period in this case runs from February 15th of 1973 through March 30th of 2008. That's -- and that's the last 10 years of the penalty period.

This is just a brief graphic about how the merger operated between International Paper and Champion. There was actually another company called Condor that was part of that merger, and we'll get into that detailed story through a witness called Joan Meyer.

Here are the factors that we think you should consider. Of course, you can consider the evidence, because that's your sole province of what evidence you consider and what evidence you believe; but here are the factors that Harris County thinks the evidence will show that should be considered in determining the penalty of this matter.

MIMC knew it was not supposed to let liquid waste leave the pits. It purposely voted to abandon the site and walk away. It benefitted financially from walking away by not taking care of the sludge that had been placed on the side of the river. It did nothing about the waste pits after 1985, when the EPA designated dioxin as being hazardous. It did nothing about the waste pits after 1988, with the studies of dioxin being in the wastepaper sludge.

And I don't think you're going to hear evidence that MIMC had any other site to be dealing with other than the site we're here about. So it did nothing after the EPA determined that there is dioxin in paper

mill sludge. And as we've seen from the letter in 1992, MIMC knew that the property was subject to environmental laws but did nothing and that, as a result, waste silently released for more than 35 years into the San Jacinto River.

Now, I do want to make something clear. This will not be a case in which Harris County is bringing people who have personal injuries or property damage. This is a case about civil penalties, because if you have violated the laws of this State and caused, suffered, allowed the pollution of the waters, then you should pay a penalty ranging from \$50 to \$25,000 a day, at different times. And you should pay that penalty because if you are causing, suffering, allowing the pollution of the waters of the State of Texas, then being involved in the Superfund process is not all that you should be involved in. And the State law requires a penalty be paid every day for a release into the water.

MIMC says it should pay zero dollars for zero days. A factor to consider about Champion and International Paper: Champion was told not to let liquid waste leave the pits. Champion continued to own the sludge after delivering it to MIMC. Champion remained silent as waste ponds containing its dioxin waste were engulfed by the San Jacinto River. Again,

1985, the EPA had determined that dioxin was hazardous. By 1980 Champion had to know that the dioxin was in its sludge, and then Champion and IP remained silent during this period of time.

For more than 35 years, IP, International Paper, caused, suffered, allowed and permitted its dioxin to release into the San Jacinto Er, and the law provides for a fine for every day of that release.

Champion Paper's position is zero dollars for zero days.

Here's the factors to consider for GCE, the company that originally purchased stock in MIMC. It obtained complete control over MIMC in 1992. You're not going to hear about it having any other properties. And prior to the transaction, MIMC disclosed to GCE about the site and potential for environmental liability due to the expansive nature of the environmental laws. It did nothing to stop the release of sludge. GCE bought a company for millions, and by two years later, it was not a going concern.

Here's the factors to consider about Waste Management: Waste Management of Texas merged with GC Environmental in 2003, did nothing about the site, had complete control over MIMC, failed to warn the public in the County where it has its headquarters. I think the position it's going to take in this case is it does not

have to know what it buys.

It allowed dioxin to release every day since it took control of MIMC in 2003. We believe -- Harris County believes that it's also responsible for GCE's conduct. The law provides for a fine every day of the release, and Waste Management of Texas says it owes zero dollars for zero days of releasing dioxin. Zero dollars.

I think the other evidence that the counsel for the defendants are going to discuss is what Harris County knew, and I have showed you the letters about what Harris County knew. And we will not take a position that Harris County did not know that this sludge was in the pits in '65 and '66. I don't believe they can show any evidence that Harris County knew that MIMC had abandoned this site and had failed to follow Dr. Quebedeaux's instructions that they not let liquid waste get into the San Jacinto River.

You will hear a lot of evidence about dredging in and around the site. It's on the San Jacinto River. They have to dredge the river to make it navigable for commercial boats and barges. There is going to be evidence about dredging and notification to Harris County about dredging, and that dredging may have gotten into the impoundments.

But during the period of time in which there might have been dredging into the impoundments, there is no evidence that MIMC, Waste Management, GC Environmental, Champion or International Paper said to any people, "Wait a minute. Don't dredge. We have our sludge pits in the area," because they didn't continue to maintain or inspect their sludge pits with their sludge on the sludge pits that they made.

I think you're going to hear a discussion between -- an interesting discussion between International Paper and MIMC about who owned the sludge. International Paper takes the position that they didn't own the sludge after they gave it to MIMC; and MIMC takes the position in this case, "We didn't own the sludge. All we did was -- you paid us to haul it."

Again, we don't think the law permits you to escape liability, whether you claim you owned it or didn't own it. It's whether you caused, suffered, allowed, or permitted the pollution of the waters of the State of Texas. And I think if you listen carefully to the presentations you are about to hear, you are going to hear some version of, "Not our responsibility, not our problem."

This is a reminder of why we think the Texas Water Code imposes liability. "If you cause,

suffer, allow or permit the pollution of the waters of the State of Texas, you must pay a penalty under the law."

Okay. Here is a forecast of who the witnesses we're going to bring to the stand. And I put up there "may change" because I want to be zealous of your time and not bring more witnesses than we need to bring. And depending upon how testimony comes in, we may change the lineup of witnesses. I think, shortly, however, you are going to hear from Dr. John Pardue, he's an environmental engineering professor at LSU, to talk to us about how we know that dioxin -- that sludge containing dioxin got out every day from February 15th of 1973 through March 30th of 2008.

You are going to hear from Dr. Phil Bedient, a hydrology professor from Rice University, who will also discuss how we know that sludge containing dioxin got out every day from February 15th of 1973 through March 30th of 2008.

We have brought in Joan Meyer to describe in detail the corporate transactions between Waste Management of Texas and MIMC, and GC Environmental and MIMC, and International Paper and Champion and to calculate the penalties. And we're going to present evidence from the defendants' various corporate

representatives about what they knew and didn't know with regard to the events this lawsuit is about.

You're going to hear more about Dr. John
Pardue's qualifications later from him on the stand. I
just wanted to sketch them out for you here.

Here is Dr. Phil Bedient's qualifications.

They're going to talk real briefly about the waste material in the pits, how the failure to maintain the levees resulted in a breach in the levees starting in 1973, and that how by mid 1989, 14.05 acres of the site of the 20 acres were submerged below the San Jacinto River, and how that contamination from 1973 continued to release daily for the next 35 years.

That's the picture from 1973, where you can see a breach in the berms. It is located right here (indicating). I think we'll be able to get you a better copy. From that day on, you can see the waters from the San Jacinto River are able to flow in and out of the impoundments. And this is the waters around the San Jacinto River.

By the way, in the history -- in one of the documents, the best description we have of this material is it's a cheap grade, or cheaper grade of cardboard, like egg cartons. That's how it was described in 1966, a cheaper grade of carton, like an egg carton. I think

they must mean the cardboard cartons, not the current ones.

It's the defendants' position from their experts, and I think you'll hear the evidence from the stand on this, it is their position that this cheaper grade of cardboard, like an egg carton, did not release into the San Jacinto River, but remained physically intact in these impoundments for the entire 35-year period of time we're talking about, and that if there were any releases, the only releases came as a result of dredging.

I believe you're going to hear evidence from one of their experts who told me that he couldn't tell me any more specifically about what this material was, because I questioned him about that. And he said, "Well, I can't. I said, "You are not saying it's like concrete, are you?" He said, "No, I'm not saying it's like concrete." I said, "Well, between a cheap grade of cardboard and concrete, what would you say it's like?" He couldn't be more specific.

So it's going to be the defendants'
position, I believe, from the evidence they're going to
put on the stand, that this material was something
between a cheap grade of cardboard and concrete that
withstood wind, water, tides, hurricane and flood for

35 years and never released into the San Jacinto River.

I don't think I need to say much more about that.

One of the pieces of evidence in this case is a surveyor's report that came from June of 1989. And this is basis of Dr. Pardue and Dr. Bedient's opinion that the site was underwater, if I haven't done a good job of explaining this.

Here is the roadway and here is the site as of 1989 (indicating). Now, you'll remember it doesn't look like the site looked when they first put it there, because this portion here is underwater. That's the surveyor's report from mid 1989, showing that 14.05 and portions of all three of the pits were underwater, were underwater every day thereafter.

And, yet, it is defendants' position in this case that none of the paper mill sludge containing dioxin got out into the water, because this cheap grade of cardboard that is something between cheap cardboard and concrete withstood the water, the wind, the rain, and the tides for decades. If you have ever put a box in your yard in Houston, a good cardboard box in your yard in Houston, you know how long it stands up to the humidity in the air.

There are three different statutes that

we're suing under: The Texas Water Code, the Texas Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the Texas Spill Act, three different environmental statutes. They each have different requirements, and we'll explain each of those in more detail, but I do want to sketch those for you now.

The Texas Water Code states, "If you cause, suffer, allow or permit pollution of the waters of the State of Texas, you have to pay a civil penalty of between \$50 to \$25,000 for each day that waste is discharged." The decision about how much per day is your decision. It is the jury's decision about how much, between \$50 and \$25,000 a day should be imposed for this conduct.

Harris County has asked for the maximum amount of penalties, but it will be your decision about what penalty to grant and how many days.

The next statute that Harris County is suing under is the Texas Solid Waste Disposal Act. And it states "If you cause, suffer, allow or permit disposal of industrial solid waste in a manner as to cause a discharge or imminent threat of discharge into or adjacent to the waters of the State of Texas" -- this one has got a little bit different requirement -- "into the waters or adjacent to the waters of the State of

Texas, you have to pay a civil penalty of between \$50 and \$25,000 for each day the waste is discharged."

Let me remind you, during the earlier period of time, it's not \$25,000, it's a thousand dollars and then it moves to \$5,000, and then to \$10,000 during different periods of time. That's why we're bringing Ms. Meyer here, to explain that to you from the stand about what the penalties were during the different periods of time, because we're talking about a period of time of 35 years.

The final statute that we think has been violated is the Texas Spill Act. "If you do not immediately undertake all reasonable actions to abate and remove a discharge or spill of hazardous substances" -- remember, the EPA designated dioxin as a hazardous substance -- "you have to pay a civil penalty between \$50 a day and \$25,000 for each day discharge occurs."

If you piled all of the days together and all of the maximum penalties together, this would be the maximum penalties that you would award against Champion and International Paper. That's a \$1.591 billion in penalties, the same amount from MIMC, \$1.591 billion, and for Waste Management of Texas it would \$698 million for statutory penalties and violations.

permits Harris County to recover its reasonable attorney's fees. In this case, since 19 -- since 2011, my firm has incurred over \$10 million in work on this case. We have a contract with Harris County. That contract permits us to recover up to a capped amount, a portion of the civil fines and penalties. So there are two things: We recover up to a capped amount, and we can talk about that in more detail and Ms. Baker is going to get on the stand and explain that, of the civil fines and penalties, number one; number two, that also means since 2011 we have been working on this case and we have not been paid.

The last thing I want to do is just walk you through the aerial photographs of this site. And what the evidence will show from these aerial photographs is we're going to go from 1962 on forward in time, and you will see the development of industry and neighborhoods around this site. And for each one of these in 1973, it is defendants' position that they should pay not one dollar for one day for violating any of these statutes, and that despite what you see on the screen, despite what you see in your eyes, none of the paper mill sludge containing dioxin ever got out of these pits until there was some dredging sometime in, I

don't know, the '70s or the '90s.

In 1974, it is still defendants' position that they should pay not one dollar for one day of violation of any of the statutes that we put up on the screen because none of the dioxin got out of these impoundments. In 1978, we're starting to see more industry and more development around the site. In 1978, another picture. And despite what you see on the screen, it is still defendants' position that this substance, which was a waste product from making paper, remained intact in these impoundments, despite what you see on the screen.

There is a close-up of 1978, 1979, 1981.

It's Harris County's position that every day after February 15th of 1973, paper mill sludge containing dioxin was releasing into the San Jacinto River. 1985, 1995, 2005. And that there had been 35 years of violations of the Texas environmental statutes. And for that, these defendants should pay civil fines and penalties.

So that's the thumbnail sketch of our case. We understand how valuable your time is, and we're going to try to put on an efficient case. We appreciate your time and your service, and I'll sit down now and conclude our opening.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wotring. 1 Mr. Benedict. 2 3 Then, ladies and gentlemen, after this opening, we'll take a break. 4 5 **OPENING STATEMENT** 6 BY MR. BENEDICT 7 Thank you, Your Honor. 8 Good morning. 9 THE JURY: Good morning. 10 MR. BENEDICT: It's been a few days since 11 the voir dire, so I'll reintroduce myself. I'm Tony 12 Benedict and I represent the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, and if Ms. Secord could stand up, 13 14 she may be here at the trial and she represents the 15 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. We're 16 assistant attorney generals in the Environmental Protection Division of the Texas Attorney General's 17 18 office. Been a long time. We work for the State of 19 Texas. 20 I'm going to do something right now I 21 suspect you did not think any of the lawyers would say 22 when they walked into the courtroom this morning, and 23 that is, "I'll be very brief." I'm not especially sure 24 lawyers are allowed to say that, but I will be brief 25 this morning.

As we explained in voir dire, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality is when local governments file a suit under certain state laws, we're a necessary and indispensable party. Long word; it means we have to be here.

And as the stipulation from the Court came in this morning, if a civil penalty is awarded, the TCEQ -- that's the short for the environmental agency -- splits the penalties with Harris County. That's required by statute. And so that's why we're here and we'll be participating. The TCEQ is the primary environmental agency for the State of Texas, and that's why we're here.

I'm not going to be going through a summary of evidence because I don't anticipate, like Mr. Wotring did or that I expect the defendants will do later on, because we're not going to be putting on a long case. I don't intend to sponsor a lot of evidence or documents. There might be something, but I don't anticipate a lot, so I'm not going to go through that long summary.

But there is something I do need to talk to you about. And Mr. Wotring mentioned attorney's fees for Harris County. Like Harris County, the statute provides for the State of Texas, TCEQ, to recover its attorney's fees. I don't want to dwell on that because

that's not a major part of the case, but I wanted you to understand and have that on the table up front, that the TCEQ will be asking to recover a reasonable attorney's fees. It is up to the Judge -- you know, the circumstances, when we're allowed to recover and not, those are issues for the Judge; but you may be asked to decide what is a reasonable amount.

And the TCEQ will bring in a witness,

Mr. Mark Walters. He's from our office. He's an

experienced attorney. He has worked for the Assistant

Attorney General's office, but also in private practice,

and he'll explain to you what he believes a reasonable

attorney's fee is.

I'm not going to go into that evidence in detail. We'll let Mr. Walters do it; he can do a better job than me because he's the expert. But it will be based upon the actual hours of time by the Assistant Attorney General in the case, and whether he thinks those are reasonable and also an hourly rate, called the billable hour rate for lawyers, but it's an hourly rate based on what he feels is reasonable.

Enough of that. I just wanted to get that out up front, because we're going to be talking about that. And that's really all I have to say. I told you I would be brief.

1 What you are doing, serving on a jury, is 2 important; and I do want to thank you very much for 3 taking the time to participate. Thank you, Mr. Benedict. 4 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're 5 going to take a ten-minute break and we'll proceed with 6 7 the rest of opening statements. 8 (After a break, the jury was present and 9 the following proceedings were had:) 10 THE COURT: Please be seated. 11 One of the things I meant to explain to 12 you, just from a technical standpoint, is sometimes when 13 we start, if we're starting with the projector, things may show up on your individual screens, like they do on 14 mine and the witness's, before it comes up on the big 15 16 screen. Okay. 17 You may proceed, Mr. Carter. 18 MR. CARTER: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 **OPENING STATEMENT** 20 BY MR. CARTER Good afternoon. 21 THE JURY: Good afternoon. 22 23 MR. CARTER: We've had some interesting 24 admissions this morning about this case. Now, I was 25 taking notes; and, of course, your collective memory may

be better, and we'll have a record of it later, but my recollection is, is that the County's position now in this case is that nothing happened that they're complaining about during the initial operation back in 1965 and 1966.

Their first claim that they say that they are making is a release in 1973, 7 years after the contract, after the disposal operations ended in May 1966. That's very important. That's very important.

Nothing about this case is about the operation, itself, the disposal operation, is what the County has said. What this case is about is about the, as they put it, the failure to maintain after the waste went into the disposal site; and that failure to maintain, according to them, started February 15, 1973, when they say the first release occurred.

They also said it's not about putting this into the pits. Another statement, this case is not about putting the material into the pits; but every day, they say, every day -- and we're going to hear the evidence about that -- every day after 1973 releasing material into the San Jacinto River. That's their position. The evidence about that is going to be different.

Now, sitting here listening to the government's case, when you follow all of the existing government rules that were in effect back in 1965 and 1966, you admittedly get the government's approval, not only for the method by which the disposal was going to happen, not only do you get the chief environmental officer on March 5th, 1965, to make an approval of this site after his personal inspection of the site, he then states that the location is ideal for the purposes for which it's intended. And we're going to look back at those letters. And then he writes a second letter approving the operation.

The Government, the chief environmental officer for Harris County was all over this; and it was all over this because he had the approval. And we're going to talk about that some more in a minute.

We have evidence here -- and let me say this: What you're hearing a lot about is going to be what we call "lawyer talk," and that's in this period of time that's opening statement and in the final argument. You're going to see these documents. But what you're not going to hear from are any people involved in this operation on anybody's part. Dr. Quebedeaux died back in 1978. None of the people with Champion that were involved here -- you're not going to hear any witness

testimony.

We're now 50 years, 50 years afterwards. The people involved here are long gone. So the only thing you're going to have are documents. And you're going to need to look at those documents and interpret those documents based upon what they say, not what some lawyer says about that. And we'll be talking about those documents throughout the case.

But let's get some basic understanding here about this case, and these are very important points.

These are what I call the keys to the gate.

IP is part of the solution through the Superfund process to a situation that it did not create, and I'm speaking of International Paper here, that it did not create. And let me read back to you just a couple of statements that Judge Baker read this morning. And they're very important here, folks, because what we're dealing with here are specific statutes that the County is claiming that we violated.

And those statutes have specific words in them, and each word in those statutes is very important. And the instructions that Judge Baker will give you at the end of the case concerning those statutes is very important.

I find it surprising -- and we'll get to

this shortly -- but I found it surprising that the County would not show you the precise language in their opening statement about the statutes that they are claiming we violated. And we're going to talk about that, because the language of these statutes is important.

The reason language is important, especially when you're trying to punish a company for 50 years and recover \$1.6 billion, part of which is going to go to the lawyers and part of which is going to go into the general fund of Harris County and the State, is that you need to understand what the rules are. You need to understand what the violations are.

Let me give an example. 5:00 o'clock traffic. We're going down the highway. We stop.

Traffic is backed up. Someone comes in, fails to stop and we get into a chain collision accident. It happens -- it happens frequently.

The Superfund process, as it's been described here by Judge Baker, is involving the environmental investigation and remediation of the site that is being performed or paid for by the defendants, as required by federal law. When this accident happens on the Southwest Freeway at 5:00 p.m., a chain collision, several cars involved, the -- there is the

claims being involved with the property damage. The insurance companies sort that out. But a Harris County Sheriffs Deputy comes on the scene -- and remember, we're stopped in our car and it's not Deputy Loya, but we're stopped in our car and he gives us a ticket for speeding when we're stopped in our car, okay.

This lawsuit is not about the remedies for getting your car fixed, going through the insurance company process and getting that work done. This is about the speeding ticket, were you speeding on that specific day. And so you have to look at what does the statute say. You have to look at the language of the specific statute.

That's what this case is about, folks.

It's about that speeding ticket. It's not about the cleanup of this site. The -- the -- any penalty payments that are assessed here, it's not going for the site remediation. It has nothing to do with the cleanup of this site.

The lawsuit, and this is Judge Baker's words, "The lawsuit that you are here about is separate and independent of the EPA's Superfund process." That's going to be handled -- that's being handled. It's being handled by the EPA.

But what we're dealing with here is, was

there a violation of a specific statute at a specific point in time.

IP purchased Champion. It was a separate, ongoing concern. It purchased Champion in 2000. There is no requirement that you do due diligence. There is no requirement -- if you want to buy something and you don't want to look under the cover, you don't have to. You can buy -- you can go out and buy a house and never do any due diligence. You can buy a car and don't do any due diligence. There is no requirement that a company do any due diligence here.

They decided to buy this company. They did, and for the reasons I described in voir dire. And you may remember, there was another company, a foreign company, that was coming in, trying to buy and they did have to move quickly to keep the business here in the U.S.

The other point here is the County approved the disposal operation and helped design the site in the 1960's. We've talked about that briefly; we're going to talk about it a little bit more.

The County did not complain about the disposal operation until 2011, 50 years after International Paper had been working with MIMC and the EPA. And so the County now wants to punish us, a

company that is working as part of the solution to
the -- with the Superfund process and get -- and you
heard it -- billions of dollars for the lawyers and for
the County and the State general funds.

Champion followed the rules back in the 1960's when it disposed of the waste. It followed those waste disposal rules. It found reputable companies, Ole Peterson and then MIMC, to dispose of the waste from the paper mill. And we have seen other evidence; and, in fact, the letters that were shown to you were written to Burma Engineering, who is associated with Ole Peterson. That was the same company -- or not the same company, but related companies, and Mr. Burns -- we will pull out that letter in just a second. That letter was written to Mr. Burns, the contractor, talking about the waste disposal process that is no longer about this case.

Our contractor worked with the County's chief environmental officer to get approval for the waste disposal site, which this County, itself -- which the County, itself, described as "ideal." And we'll look at those documents, as well.

We obtained the County's design input and approval of the site. The contractor built the site at the ideal location and according to the County's design specification. And then Champion turned over the

operation by contract.

We did the right thing. We got an expert contractor to go in, remove the material from our facility, transport it to the disposal site that the County had approved, and then the contractor put the material into the site that had been prepared by the contractor.

That's it. That's it. That's what
Champion did; they hired somebody that was expert,
reputable, to do this specific operation; and then it
lasted from September of '65 until May of '66.

We've seen a couple of photos showing the site. This is the 1964 photo showing the site, showing just a few months before the County was involved, went out to the site and inspected it. On the timeline, you see they went out in March of '65. That photo shows the site existing at that time.

And here is the photo after it. And you can see the area of the filling, right here (indicating). This is the site, itself, where it was constructed. That was the existence of the site back at that point in time, under the rules existing and approved by the County.

So we followed all the government's rules.

In fact, there was no requirement that we get the

County's approval back then. It was a "wild west" in connection with disposal operations back in 1965.

Companies could do what they wanted to do, without getting any permits, without getting any regulations for disposal of waste; but we went a step beyond and required our contractor to make certain that Dr. Quebedeaux, the County's chief environmental officer, approved the site.

Let's go back to the '60s for a second, folks. And y'all remember -- my name is Winn Carter. And I went back and looked for a picture of me from 1965, about the fourth grade. I was born in '54, 1954. Things have changed, unfortunately, in some respects, but things have changed significantly since 1965. rules have changed. The knowledge base has changed. Activities have changed. Regulations have changed. There has been change consistently over the last 50 years.

But what the Government wants to do is to try to put that -- the new time frame, the new regulations, and impose them back to the time of 1964 and '65 and '66.

Here is another example: You know, cars didn't have seat belts back then. This is how technology has changed over time. I mean, my dad -- I

remember my dad reaching across -- when we were making a turn or he was coming to a sudden stop, the seat belt was his arm coming across me and pushing me back against the seat.

That's the type of regulation that has changed over this period of time. Today, if you put somebody in that car seat, based upon what we have today, it would be a big problem.

This is the standard for today. We have to look at this case for the standards according to the laws in place in 1965, 1966, 1973, when the Spill Act went into effect; in 1985, when the Solid Waste Disposal Act went into effect in 1975. We have to look at these issues with the -- with the specific statutes in mind.

So if we hired responsibly a waste contractor, we got government approval, we're now working with the federal government over the last few years at the site, it's important for you to know that our relationship here needs to be focused on the time period that we've allowed.

Now, we're going to get into the statutes. Here are the claimed penalty periods, starting February 15th of 1973, December 31st of 1975 for the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and then the Spill Act, the claimed penalty period for the Spill Act beginning in

1 1985.

Now, 1985, as I mentioned earlier, that's over almost 20 years after the material was placed into the site. So let's look at those statutes real briefly. This is the Solid Waste Disposal Act -- excuse me -- the Spill Act.

Why is ownership important? You said that there was going to be some issues about ownership. Any owner of any onshore facility, any operator or person in charge of any onshore facility.

There is no dispute here, folks. We were not operating this facility. We never -- we contracted to have someone to put property -- to put waste onto property owned by another person. That's what we did. The waste went onto someone else's property. It was disposed of by the contractor, and that was it.

Ownership is important, and that's the reason these statutes -- let me give you another example. I have a friend, Joe, and he drives a Corvette that's similar to Mr. Villareal's. Unfortunately, Joe has a lead foot. I'm sure that's different from Mr. Villareal.

But he picked me up for lunch one afternoon to go to lunch. We get on the Katy Freeway. We're late for lunch. He gooses it. The Harris County Sheriff's

department officer pulls up, stops us for speeding, 70 in a 60-mile-an-hour zone.

I'm riding as the passenger. He writes the ticket to Joe, but then he turns around and writes me a ticket, as the passenger. Now, the statute for speeding is any operator of a motor vehicle driving in excess of the speed limit can be fined. Any operator of a moving vehicle driving in excess of the speed limit can be fined.

He gives me the ticket as the passenger.

I'm not the operator. But when I turned -- he walks

away before I get out of the car to complain, so I have

to come to court and defend myself for that.

When I come to court, I have a jury. I say I wasn't the operator, I wasn't operating the motor vehicle. Case dismissed; I win. I was not violating that specific statute at the time that I was written the ticket.

That's the point that we're trying to get across with these specific acts, because it says "Any owner, operator or person in charge of any onshore facility" in 1985, 20 years -- and remember that the statute goes into effect 20 years -- the statute for the Spill Act goes into effect in 1985, 20 years after we, through our contractor, dispose of waste on the property

not owned by us.

There is no dispute in this case, ladies and gentlemen, that we were the operator of this onshore facility or that we were the person in charge of the facility at this point in time in 1985. The disposal operation had -- by MIMC, had stopped in 1966.

So we're going to have to look at the specific language of the statute to make certain that what is being said is precisely what we're looking at.

Let's look at the -- briefly, let's look at the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and remember that the Solid Waste Disposal Act goes into effect in 1975, 10 years after the disposal operation. And remember, we didn't own the property.

And it has -- in addition to the requirements of this title, no person may "cause, suffer, allow or permit the disposal of industrial solid waste" in 1975, beginning in 1975, okay.

I heard something interesting during the County's presentation about cause, suffer, allow or permit, and that was the power to stop. That was the language they used, "the power to stop."

Now, I don't know how Judge Baker -- what instruction she's going to give us concerning cause, suffer, allow or permit, or what power someone that

didn't own the property, didn't construct the site, didn't have an obligation to maintain the site -- in fact, the County -- you'll hear from the County witnesses, I believe it's Dr. Bedient, that they never said we had the responsibility to maintain this site after -- after the contract terminated. And there is a dispute as to when the contract ends.

You're going to see that our contract ended July 1. We believe the evidence is going to show you that the contract ended July 1, 1966, over -- almost 10 years before the Solid Waste Disposal Act even went into effect.

So what I'm saying is, no person may "cause, suffer, allow or permit" is going to have some special meaning. The County says that we had the power to stop. We didn't own the land. So what special relationship did we have to be able to go onto somebody else's land and stop something from occurring? What special relationship existed? That's going to be one of the issues.

Did we own the waste at that time?

Interesting, folks, when it goes into the land -- this is hard material. In fact, as it's described back in the documents -- and you'll see those -- as it's described in the documents, trees will grow on it, grass

will grow on it. It becomes part of the land.

There was never any issue -- you are not going to see any documents that we maintained some interest in this waste, that we had some property interest in the waste, or that there was some agreement with the record title owner that we had any interest in the waste after it was disposed of. It became part of the land. As a result, it became part of the property.

There is no special interest here, no special relationship that we had under these particular statutes that we violated any specific language of these statutes.

In addition, the Texas Water Quality Act -and this is the one that he showed you no person may
"cause, suffer, allow or permit" the discharge of any
waste or the performance of any activity in violation.
No person may "cause, suffer" -- again, there is going
to be a requirement, at least in the County's mind.
We'll have to hear from Judge Baker, but at least in the
County's mind that we have the power to stop, to go onto
someone else's property and stop some activity from
happening. There is no evidence of that.

So here is some testimony from Dr. Bedient.

Dr. Bedient is testifying, and you heard his name

mentioned as one of the experts in the case. But at

```
1
   this point in time, he's testifying as the Harris County
   representative, as a representative of the County, in
2
3
   his capacity as a representative of the County.
4
                 And he says, taking the County's position,
   "Champion didn't own the site, did they?
5
                 ANSWER:
                           I don't believe so.
6
7
                 Champion didn't design the impoundments at
8
   the site, did they?"
9
                 Now, this is Harris County talking.
10
                 "Champion didn't design the impoundments at
11
   the site, did they?
12
                 I don't believe so.
13
                 Champion did not construct the impoundments
   at the site, did they?
14
15
                 That's -- you're correct.
16
                 Nor did International Paper, correct?"
17
                 He states, "You're correct."
18
                 International Paper didn't own the property
19
   on which the impoundments was located, correct?
20
                 ANSWER:
                          Correct.
                 They didn't design the levees at the
21
22
   impoundments?
23
                 That's correct.
24
                 They didn't build them?
                 No."
25
```

Yet, the County wants for us to have some relationship under these specific statutes, the power to stop, yet the property wasn't owned by us, it wasn't designed by us, it wasn't maintained by us, no requirement. In fact, Dr. Bedient says, "All that Champion did was contract with the company to have material hauled from the paper mill and taken to the site; is that right?

Right."

That's what we did. We hired a reputable contractor, someone skilled in doing this type of operation. We turned the operation over to them. They then did the operation, and the operation ceased in 1966.

It's admitted. You didn't own the site, didn't build the site, no control over the site, hired a waste contractor to dispose of the waste, no knowledge that there was a claim discharged at the site by us, the Government approved every single aspect of the operation, and now we're involved in the cleanup of the site. Yet, now, the County wants to come back and sue us for billions of dollars for doing what was right.

So as we go through the evidence, listen to the testimony of Dr. Bedient and others that take the stand, about our activities, what we were responsible

for. What we did, Champion did, was haul material from the paper mill and take it to the site by our contractor.

Let's go back to the timeline just for a second. There is a couple of other interesting things about this timeline. October 1981, the records that you'll see from this case came from various sources. They did not come from the county; the County's records were destroyed in 1981. So the records that you see from Dr. Quebedeaux, these came from files, not from the County's files, on the approval of the site. We don't have the records from the County as to what occurred, if anything, if they have any records, what occurred after 1966.

Here is the letter -- and I just showed this to you. The County approves the location. The location of the spoil pond, June 11th, 1965, the location of the proposed spoil pond, which is located on the west bank of the San Jacinto River, just north of the Highway 73 Bridge "seems to be ideal for the purpose for which you intend to use it. This is particularly so since the bottom and sides, or dikes, are composed of clay, which should render it practically impossible for seepage to escape and enter into the San Jacinto River."

Here is a telephone conversation with

Dr. Quebedeaux in March of 1965, and this is from our -our records, Champion's records: "He approved," Burns,
Bobby Burns, a "method of developing a pond and storing
these waste materials at the mouth of the San Jacinto
River." Dr. Quebedeaux went further to say that he had
inspected the Burns equipment and ventured an opinion
that this equipment "was the best he had seen," the
equipment that he was going to be performing this
disposal operation in.

He did not, by direct statement, indicate disapproval of any other method of disposal, but did say that the Burns method, the method that was used at this moment, was "the most satisfactory of any that he knew of."

How much more do you need from the County? What else would you need from the County, approving the type of operation we did? This is testimony by Dr. Quebedeaux at a hearing. Dr. Quebedeaux: "Well, I was originally involved with the original contractor in helping design the present pits. They were set up so that there would be no discharge of any kind."

We studied this for several months, had other bids from contractors, had others that -- we wanted to make sure that this process -- that we did our due diligence on the process. And you'll see those

documents; it's a thick document showing what we did on the due diligence; and he approved the entire operation.

And here is a picture of Dr. Quebedeaux. I said he died in '78. Actually, he died in '76. This man was not just a government official. He had six degrees. He had done chemical research. He had a B.S. and master's, a Ph.D. in chemistry, had a law degree, industrial engineer, worked in the industry. And from 1953 through 1976 he was the director of the Air and Water Pollution Control section of Harris County, the position that Mr. Allen, who y'all will hear from, holds today. And he's written more than 20 papers. This was not a gentleman that was just out there. He was trained. He was knowledgeable in approving the operation.

We have seen that the site was above the water in 1966 and surrounded by land. In fact, here is some testimony from Mr. Allen where he is saying for the Pollution Control Board, "And I think -- what did you say, that this is not -- this is not a Pollution Control suit?"

And what he's doing is talking about a Pollution Control office, his position. "This is not a Pollution Control suit? So you no longer have control over the case or the penalty being assessed?"

What does he say? "Correct." 1 Is that because Dr. Quebedeaux, his 2 3 predecessor, had approved this operation? 4 Here is further testimony -- and he's designated as the County representative. And this is 5 testimony -- we've been talking about dioxin, and I want 6 7 to get into that just for a minute. 8 When this disposal site -- we talked about dioxin a little bit. We talked about it earlier. 9 We 10 talked about it becoming a hazardous waste in 1985. 11 Dioxin was not known to anybody before the 1980s. 1965, 12 1966, no one knew that dioxin was part of the paper mill 13 process. No one knew about that. That didn't happen 14 until the '80s, 20-plus years after this disposal had 15 been done. 16 Also, dioxin is -- is in a lot -- has a lot of different sources. And here is some testimony again 17 18 from Mr. Allen: 19 "And the incineration of municipal and 20 industrial waste, that certainly occurs. 21 "You have incineration of industrial waste. "And certainly that has been known by 22 23 Harris County, who have people and cars drive around. "That's correct. 24 25 "All of these are sources for dioxin and

1 you can get dioxin from that, right? "Yes. 2 "As a combustion by-product? 3 "Yes. 4 "And that goes into the area here and it 5 comes down through the rains, correct? 6 7 "Correct. 8 "And it can go into the storm water runoffs 9 and bayous of Harris County and then into the river, 10 right? "Yes, it could do that." 11 12 So -- "And Harris County acknowledges that there are other sources of dioxin in the San Jacinto 13 14 River other than the San Jacinto site in question, 15 correct? 16 "That is a known fact, yes." 17 Now, that is not to say that this does not 18 need to be cleaned up. That's the Superfund process. 19 What we're talking about is a violation of a statute, a 20 violation of a statute where penalties, if any, should 21 be considered. 22 Once dioxin is created through this --23 through the process, it seeks to bind itself to the 24 organic material, the pulp material in the paper mill 25 waste, so rather than float on the water, it will seek

to become part of something physical, so it will bind itself to the paper mill waste, to the pulp itself. And here that means that the dioxin wants to bind with that wood fiber and not go anywhere else.

And Harris County knows and admits that there are lots of sources of dioxin, as we've discussed. And you can also fingerprint dioxin, so you can identify the source from which dioxin comes from. So because the specific dioxin has a specific fingerprint, just like the fingerprints on my hands, you can also find a fingerprint for dioxin and where it comes from. That's because in the '80s, in the '80s now, for the first time, that technology had been developed to detect dioxin in minute amounts like never before and with greater specificity.

And it's at that point in time -- and we heard a little bit about the 104 Mill Study and the 5 Mill Study, because neither the Government nor the paper industry, nor anyone else, thought there could be dioxin in paper mill waste. The paper mills were not on the list.

But by random testing the Government began to think in 1983 that there might be dioxin coming from the paper mills. And this is a brief mention from a -- from the 5 Mill Study that says dioxin is not known in

waste until 1985, when this 5-mill -- the five paper mills were studied, that this 5 Mill Study revealed that this early screening study of five bleached Kraft mills -- and "Kraft" is a specific process -- "confirmed that the pulp-bleaching process was primarily responsible for the formation of the CDDs and CDFs."

So don't get confused. Dioxin wasn't known back in 1965 and '66. Don't be confused by that. Not until 1985 was it even first identified as part of the process.

The next study was called the 104 Mill Study and was published in the early '90s. That study confirmed that it was the bleaching process that created dioxin. A big surprise, given that everyone always thought that only incineration or burning caused dioxin.

The paper industry changed the type of chlorine it used for bleaching, and the problem was fixed. So it was all about one specific chemical.

So the Government knows quite a bit about dioxin and all the sources for it, and it knows that it can take any piece of dioxin and pinpoint it to a particular source. And that same science is how we all know that this waste is not responsible for all of the pollution in the San Jacinto River.

And the Government knows that, too -- and

the Government knows that.

Now, we've talked a little bit about dredging. It wasn't to open the channel; it was for sand mining. This is an area for sand mining, so that it can be used in buildings and roads.

And there were a number of sand dredging companies that operated in this area. And what happened was as -- and this operation had been going on for many, many years, since like the '70s. And, in fact, if you look at this letter, this is -- and you heard Mr. Owen as he was identified earlier as one of the lawyers here in the case, the chief environmental lawyer for Harris County, "As a matter of fact from some photos I reviewed recently that were taken back in the '70s it looks like a large portion of one of the cells, one of the portions of the impoundments, one of the portions of the disposal site, "was dredged away."

This is a statement by the County lawyer, from Rock Owens, who is sitting here in this courtroom. An admission by these lawyers that dredging was involved and was causing -- as far back as the '70s, "It looks like a large portion of one of the cells were dredged away."

What this sand mining also does, ladies and gentlemen, it can affect and change the course of the

river; and that has the impact of bringing water closer to the area.

There is something else that's involved here, and that's subsidence. From the '60s up until the '80s, this land dropped 10 feet because groundwater was pumped from this area, 10 feet in elevation. So you have a lot of different activities going on, subsidence, dredging that are impacting this particular site.

We also have another slide here -- and you'll see all of these. In looking over the more recent data, I believe more firmly -- this is a gentleman by the name of Andrew Sipocz. Mr. Sipocz is with the Texas Parks & Wildlife division. He wrote this back in 2005 and said this to one of his colleagues, Patricia Radloff: "I believe more firmly that the recent sand mining was responsible for the increase in dioxin levels at the site noted between 1994 and 2002."

These documents confirm -- and there will be other testimony -- these documents confirm what was going on at this particular site and how the dioxin moved out of the site. And you're going to see photographs and documents that show the migration and how this -- how the dioxin migrated out of the site due to dredging.

We believe at the end of the case the Judge

is going to give you some instructions concerning these specific statutes and how they apply to International Paper. I can't predict what those instructions may be; but I do believe that they're going to have, "Did International Paper have the right and the power," the right and the power. And that comes from having a relationship not simply to the waste as it was generated, that we were a waste generator in the stream, but did we have the power at the time that these statutes went into effect to stop some type of discharge when we didn't own the land, we didn't have an obligation to maintain it.

And the County, I believe, will say that, that we had no responsibility for this particular activity in 1973, 7 years after the last disposal; 1975, 10 years, 9 years after the last disposal; and then 1985, 20 years after disposal. It's going to be incumbent upon you to review the statutes, the Court's instructions, to deal with this, to deal with the statutes.

You're not going to hear from one single government employee who is going to say that they had any contact with Champion Paper or International Paper at any time after the original disposal until 2011, or 2008 when the Superfund process came on board, but

certainly not until 2011, when we were sued, had one single complaint about what we did in 1966, to cause some release in 1973, to cause some release in 1975, to cause some release under these specific statutes. Not a single document from '73 forward that Harris County says, "Champion, you've got a problem out at this site." There is not going to be one document that says that. Yet, they knew about the site. They understood where the site was. They had knowledge about the site, and didn't do anything about it.

In fact, to the contrary, what you're going to see, what you're going to see from the documents is that we did the right thing, we hired a responsible contractor. We made sure that the County was not -- was involved and approved what we were going to do. And the only documents that you're going to see will show a professional, lawful operation that MIMC carried out and managed this material.

Because of the delay in bringing this suit, we can't bring any live witnesses to you, as I mentioned earlier. And it's unfortunate, because I think if we had live witnesses here, if we had the Champion people that were involved back in 1966, if we could ask Dr. Quebedeaux some questions, we would be able to -- we might get some interesting answers about that. But

we're not going to be able to hear from them. All you are going to have is the documents.

The evidence will show we have not violated any of the statutes under which we've been accused, we did not own or operate the facility in '85, we did not have any ownership or control of the land in or after 1973, and even before. We never had any ownership or control of the land, but certainly in 1973 when they claim that we had a penalty when the first discharge occurred. And we contracted to have our waste hauled away in a way approved by the County. You don't expect the County to come knocking at your door some 50 years later saying, "Hey, what you did back 50 years ago is wrong."

Thank you for your attention. We look forward to presenting our case to you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go ahead and take our lunch break, and we will start back up at 10 after 2:00.

(After a break, the jury was present and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

You may proceed, Ms. Hinton.

\*

## OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. HINTON:

Good afternoon, everyone.

THE JURY: Good afternoon.

MS. HINTON: I'm glad you've had your lunch. We're back. I get my chance again to talk with all of y'all and give what is called my opening statement, where I'll give you a little summary of the evidence that MIMC believes will come out in this case.

I wanted to introduce you again to my law partner, Melanie Gray, who is going to try this case with me. And you'll hear us refer to MIMC again throughout this case. I shortened it from McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation to MIMC.

But I also have someone else here today for y'all to meet, and his name is Mr. Kinnan Goleman.

Mr. Goleman, would you stand up, please? (Complies)

Mr. Goleman is going to be the corporate representative here. He's going to testify here for MIMC.

But I've got to tell you that, you know, and I told you the other day, that MIMC ceased operations as a waste disposal company in 1994. So what we had to do, because the -- Harris County deposed and

talked to folks before this trial began, we had to do something called designating a corporate representative. And that's a little difficult 50 years after the fact, when you don't have any employees and you're not in operations.

So what we had to do -- and we're required to have somebody who can talk about the company and the events of the past. We -- Mr. Goleman is from Austin. He's a lawyer/lobbyist engaged in governmental regulations and affairs. We had to hire him to be our corporate representative.

And Mr. Goleman had the unfortunate task to have to go through all the documents that we could locate about MIMC, talk to some folks and try to piece together, as best we could, the MIMC story and the past history. The good thing, though, about Mr. Goleman is that he was around during the '60s and he was around during the '60s in this business.

You're going to hear how he, while he was in law school, worked at the Texas Water Pollution Control Board from July of 1964 to August of 1967. So we found somebody who was around at the time of the infancy of regulations and all beginning to happen on a State and local basis. So he'll help us. He certainly has helped me, and he's going to help you with the

history of MIMC and the historical perspective on the Texas environmental regulations.

I told you that MIMC is the only former operator of the site, which we're going to talk about in this trial. That was north of the I-10 highway. It was Highway 73 then. And you are going to see lots of pictures about it, as we go through this trial.

And, once again, you've heard several times -- and I'm going to repeat some of the stuff the gentleman before me have talked about -- that this site was in operation for only 9 months and then it was filled. Like any sort of waste disposal facility, when it's filled up, it gets closed and you move on.

So back then, in 1965 and 1966, there were no permits required. There was no permit required with respect to building this facility, designing this facility, or putting the material in the facility. And I'm going to talk to you a little bit more about that as we go through a PowerPoint that I put together for you.

So I -- in getting ready for this case, I also tried to put myself back in that period of 1965 and look at some of the history and the Houston area and where we all were; and it was a different time and place then. It was -- the last of the baby boomers had been born. That was 1946 to 1964. And I'm a baby boomer.

So I thought, well, what in the world -- what did things look like at that point in time, not only in Houston, but for me. So I want to take you back a little bit to 1965.

I told y'all I was from Gaston, Alabama, and I'm not that cute little blond one in the center.

My brother calls that his Woody Allen face. I'm the 10-year-old girl on the right with the big coat on and the cat-eye glasses, which some of us may have had.

That was also a time we had our dogs running loose; no leash laws back then. But that's me in Gaston, Alabama. I don't know if my picture is any cuter than Mr. Carter's, but it sure did bring back a lot of memories for me, looking at the back porch of my parents' house.

Now, what was Houston like at that time?
What was happening in the nation? Think back that this was the time that we had the second manned space program, the Project Gemini. That sure seems like a long time ago to me now. I couldn't believe it was the same year that the first full year of production for the Ford Mustang. We all remember those and folks who might have been lucky enough to drive one. Sonny and Cher had their first televised performance, and you had the Beetles at the top of the music charts.

So what was happening in Houston at that period of time? I wasn't anywhere near here. So I asked for some folks to go back and find me some pictures of what did Houston, Texas look like in 1965. Believe it or not, in the middle there you'll see what was the Humble Building, the Exxon Building. It had just been finished. It was 44 stories high; and believe it or not, it was the tallest skyscraper west of the Mississippi River in 1965.

It's amazing to look at this picture because you can also see what is happening in Houston in 1965 is, look at all the buildings that are coming up, but not the tall ones like we see today, but you can see buildings, things happening in Houston. We're starting to spread out.

Now, I also couldn't believe when I went back and checked that this was also the same time period that the Astrodome opened in 1965; and my young lawyers had never heard the phrase "The Eighth Wonder of the World." But I certainly remember when the Astrodome opened, and I was over in Alabama, but it was -- it was called "The Eighth Wonder of the World."

And I thought about what happened in the Astrodome in 1965. Believe it or not, it was -- the first baseball game held at the Astrodome, Houston beat

the Yankees 2 to 1. And Mickey Mantle hit his first indoor home run. That's how long ago this was, and that's what was happening in Houston, Texas. It was an exciting time. It was a busy time in that time period.

Now, this was appearing (indicating) -- and I would never have imagined. One of the first performances in the Astrodome was Judy Garland and the Supremes on December 17th, 1965, a pairing for a musical concert I wouldn't have thought of. But let's talk about what was happening in Houston and around Houston that was causing this influx of activity, of business, of prosperity.

Champion Paper was flourishing over on the San Jacinto River, a paper mill. There were many other industries out there in that area. And at that point in time, as y'all have heard about -- and you are going to hear these names again from me and you are going to hear them many times from the stand and as this case goes on -- they were looking for a contractor to dispose of the paper mill sludge.

So they are looking around and they're considering a number of people, but they also are interviewing a company called Ole Peterson. And that's not a man. When I first heard the name, I figured that was a name for a man. That was actually the name of a

corporation.

Ole Peterson. To sort of explain how this all fits together with the names on the documents you're going to see, you've got a Mr. Bobby Burns, who had a company, Ole Peterson, that was seeking to get the waste disposal contract for the paper mill sludge from Champion. And you also had a company named Burma Engineering. Burma Engineering wasn't a Brown & Root, wasn't of that size, but it was an engineering company and construction company in the area.

So Mr. Burns, with his company Ole Peterson and his company Burma, they wanted to start preparing for a waste disposal operation. Now, it's critical for y'all to know at the time, again, that at the time this facility was built, there was no permitting required for the construction, the design, or the maintenance, how it all ended up. There was none required. That was because environmental regulations were in their infancy. So there was no permitting system in existence.

Despite the fact that permits weren't even in existence, Bobby Burns and Ole Peterson and Burma Engineering, with Champion, wanted to make sure that this facility got the right approvals. Whether they were required by law, by permit, whatever, they wanted to take the extra effort. Knowing that there was a

gentleman in Houston at that time, Mr. Quebedeaux -- I may say it wrong, but I say Quebedeaux -- and he was the man in charge, so they contacted Dr. Quebedeaux, the County's chief environmental officer, to get involved in this process.

At this time his title was Director of the Water Pollution Control Section of Harris County Health Unit. At that point in time, it's interesting to note on the state and local levels the environmental agencies that were starting to be in existence were usually under the health departments. So, as I mentioned, permits to design, build, or operate a facility weren't required, but they sought the involvement and the commitment of Dr. Quebedeaux anyway.

Now, you're going to see these letters so many times y'all are going to have them memorized better than I do in this case; but you see first this March 1965 letter where Dr. Quebedeaux was involved and he had met with them about approving the methods of developing the facility for storing the paper mill sludge. So Dr. Quebedeaux points out in his letter that he indicated that the method that was being proposed was the most satisfactory of any that he knew of at the time.

Don't let anybody tell you that this was a

fly-by-night operation where they were slipping waste out the back door and dumping it down a drain or onto somebody else's property. That was a facility that even Dr. Quebedeaux indicated was the most satisfactory of any he knew of at the time.

Now, after satisfying Champion Paper, Ole Peterson entered into a contract for the removal of that sludge. Now, that contract was done April 29th, 1965.

Now, I'm taking you back to '65 again because it's also important to think about the nature of the material, the paper mill sludge, what was left after the processing that they stored out at their facility. But they had run out of room, and they had to figure out a way for proper disposal of it.

At this time you'll see in the contract that Champion and Ole Peterson signed that it said the sludge to be removed by contractor is not considered by the parties to be inherently harmful or dangerous. That's what folks knew and thought in 1965. That was the basis for this contract.

Now, pursuant to the contract, Ole Peterson was supposed to find a piece of land that was suitable and acceptable to Champion. And you are going to see these photos again and again over the next few weeks, but I want to put you again on this site. And this is

that 20-acre tract of land located to the north of Highway 73 and west of the San Jacinto River.

And if you-all have got things in front of you, you can probably see the bend of the river better than I can. But you can see this site was in the land, not on the river, but at this point in time inside, off the river, toward the land.

Now, it was a 20-acre tract and it was in what was already a pretty heavily industrialized area. We all know that along the San Jacinto River there are other industries, other businesses; and they were building up at that point in time and there was a lot of business going up and around there.

And the facility was approved by the director. Dr. Quebedeaux specifically approved this site. The evidence will show that this site, this 20 acres, Dr. Quebedeaux said it was ideal, it was an ideal site for the purpose for which it's intended.

It's going to be important to note, too, that none of us can take ourselves back to 1965, except in our minds when we look at photographs of ourselves from back then. But it's important to know, too, what Dr. Quebedeaux said about the material at that site. We have to remember, Dr. Quebedeaux saw it. He's not here today to testify from the stand, but he saw it.

And what did he say about that material?

They want you to think it's all sand, it fell apart, it was constantly deteriorating, there was no way it could have been secure. That is not what Dr. Quebedeaux said. Dr. Quebedeaux said that the sides, the bottoms, the dikes, they're composed of clay, which should render it practically impossible for seepage to escape and enter into the San Jacinto River.

This was a man who did his job. He checked the material. He checked the impoundments. He checked the design. He checked the construction. Even though no permit was required, the parties in this case wanted that oversight with respect to this facility.

Now, he visited the site on several occasions before it was built; and besides saying it was ideal, he went back again and sent another letter to make sure that it was clear that the site he was looking at was this one. And let me show you where that is.

If you look at what I pulled out in this letter, you'll see it's located on the west bank of the San Jacinto River just north of the Highway 73 bridge; and, once again, this letter again talks about the clay, the sides, the dikes, the ideal nature of this facility.

Now, after receiving the blessing -- didn't have a permit, but after receiving the equivalent of a

blessing from Dr. Quebedeaux, Ole Peterson, with the assistance of Burma Engineering, continued to build this facility at this site. I want to talk a little bit about the facility, and I have tried -- I'm not an engineer. So I've tried to have pictures drawn so I can best explain it to you.

The facility is surrounded by a clay levee, as Dr. Quebedeaux said. The impoundments are lined with clay and are separated by clay berms, according to what Dr. Quebedeaux said at the time. And on this western side, this left side -- and I've got another graphic demonstration to show you -- is where the material would be put and then it would settle down to the bottom. It would dry and the water would rise up.

But before that started happening, we had a little bump in the road. The bump in the road was Ole Peterson fell on hard times. Mr. Burns got extended. He ended up in bankruptcy, and he filed for bankruptcy. The plaintiff mentioned the fact that he had an IRS lien put against him with respect to what Champion owed him; and by August 19th, 1965, Ole Peterson was no longer in operation.

At this time there was a 58-year-old man who was a native Texan, and he was an entrepreneur in the area. He was born, you'll hear, in 1907 in Possum

Trot, Texas, which I looked up and it is somewhere up in East Texas and it still exists. It's not a very big place, but it's still there.

He was married to a Ruby McGinnis; and they had had two children, Lawrence and Billie Doris. They were adult children at this point in time in the 1960s. So Virgil and other McGinnis family members had had for a good while, since the '30s, a construction business; and by the mid '40s they had incorporated it into McGinnis Brothers Construction. So he was a man who was already out in business in this area and was engaged, and he knew Burma Engineering and Bobby Burns and Ole Peterson.

Now, McGinnis Brothers Construction had done a large number of projects, big and small, in this area around Houston. They had even been involved in the construction of the canal system from the Brazos River, from Alvin to Texas City. This was not a fly-by-night operation. This was a long-established businessman in the area, who fed his family, had his brothers, had his children -- they were all involved in this business.

Now, Virgil knew the Ole Peterson company and he had tried to help Bobby Burns a little bit with his accounts; but then he was in a position to take over or attempt to take over that waste disposal contract

that Ole Peterson had with Champion. So to that end, what Virgil McGinnis did was he bought that 20-acre tract of land that we've been talking about.

He stepped up and he bought that land
August 3rd, 1965; and he is the record title holder, as
Virgil C. McGinnis, Trustee. So on August 3rd, 1965,
Virgil McGinnis becomes the owner of the site that's at issue in this lawsuit.

Now, later on August 31, 1965, at the time Virgil McGinnis bought the property, MIMC didn't exist. It did not exist. MIMC was incorporated under the laws of the State of Texas on August 31, 1965 and MIMC's business was to be in the waste disposal business. Now, at this point in time, too, the Champion contract had not yet been transferred to MIMC, or to Virgil McGinnis for that matter.

Now, I want to tell you a little bit about who held the stock in McGinnis. The evidence is going to show that when they set up the company, the bylaws and the articles of incorporation say, well, you could transfer stock, transfer property, or pay cash for the stock. And the minutes reflect that Virgil paid for the stock and then he distributed the stock out to himself at 20 percent, his son at 30 percent, who was going to be the president, his daughter, Billie Doris McGinnis

Gladfelter, and then he gave 40 percent of the stock at that point in time in 1965 to his employees. Whether it was his controller, accountant, or administrative assistant, he spread the rest of the stock to the employees. This was a new operation that the McGinnises were going to get into.

But, finally, on September 10th -- and that's an important date. That is the date that the contract that Ole Peterson had had with Champion was assigned to McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation. Champion gave its consent, and now we have MIMC holding that contract for waste disposal of the paper mill sludge with Champion.

Now, you're going to see documents and hear testimony that at that point in time, within a week, they started moving, as MIMC, the paper mill sludge to this facility. And it's important for you to know, and you'll hear this, too, until -- between September 13th and September 16th of 1965, no waste material had been put in this site. This was a brand-new site, a brand-new site where they started bringing new material; and this was a site where the only material that went into this facility was this Champion paper mill sludge. Virgil McGinnis and MIMC did not haul material for other people into this site.

So I thought it was important -- you've seen the bigger pictures, and we'll look at some more. But as I described, you've got on the left side where the paper mill sludge would come in and then it was a higher area and as it settled down to the bottom, the water would rise up and run off to the pond on the right.

Now, we heard a little bit of talk, but not enough talk, in my opinion, about the nature of this material. Champion had this sludge in holding ponds up at Champion Paper. And you'll see documents that this material was so hard that you had to cut it with a water jet. Then you had to put water in it to pump it out of the Champion facility onto the barges because this material wasn't hauled by trucks to this facility. This material was hauled by barges down the San Jacinto River.

Champion, put water in it to make it what has been called the nature of cardboard or like an egg carton, in order for it to be of a texture that it could be put on the barge and moved down. Then that material was put originally on the west side of this facility; and as the material dried, that water would rise up -- and they had some pipes through the center and it would run off to

the right side of the facility.

But this material didn't remain as cardboard, wet cardboard, or egg cartons. As it dried out, it got hard. As you heard, it would solidify and ultimately grass would grow on it, trees would grow on it. There is evidence and documents in the record that they would talk about Mr. McGinnis saying he could put -- it could be used as matting and he could put his equipment on it. So I don't want you left with the impression -- the evidence is going to show that this material would solidify.

Now, once the eastern impoundment -- the western impoundment and the water would run off, I want to show y'all what happened. So as I said, the barge would come up the San Jacinto River, or down. They would then pump the barge -- from the barge into the impoundment the material. The water would run off to the right side and it would go off into the runoff pond. And then what happened to the water?

That water would then be pumped back onto the barge and taken back up to Champion to be put in their water treatment facility operations. So they had a very sophisticated operation here, where the material went in, the water drains off, the water goes back up to Champion to be treated.

So I'm not going to go through this in great detail here again because we've all touched upon these in the discussions; but I do want to remind you-all that the operations started in September of 1965, the disposal commenced. It ended May 10th, 1966, and the evidence is going to show the contract relating to this site between Champion and MIMC terminated on July 1, 1966.

Now, the facility was closed for all purposes at that time, just like any material dump. You've all seen: They fill it up, it gets pushed over -- material gets over it, it grows over, it's done. That's what happened here. The material was filled into the impoundment. It was closed, and it moved forward.

It is not, as they would like to characterize it, that somebody dumped the material in and we abandoned it in the dark of the night. That is not what happened. This was a very sophisticated operation for the time, approved by Harris County and Dr. Quebedeaux, and even reviewed and approved by the State at the time of its closing.

Now, one interesting thing, too, is they attempt to say that we went away, we didn't do a thing, we left, we abandoned it. Well, let me tell you what Harris County's own expert, Mr. Davis Ford, says. He

says that MIMC had no ongoing maintenance obligation for this facility at the time operations ceased, that once the facility was filled, there was no obligation back then to continue maintaining the site, it was a closed site; and their own expert, Mr. Davis Ford, admits that, as will other experts on the stand here.

Now, I've already talked to you about the fact Virgil McGinnis owned the property; but I want to talk to you, too, about a couple of items they brought up in Harris County's opening. One was they looked at the 1968 minutes of MIMC.

And MIMC was on a fiscal year system, which all of you are familiar with, where fiscal year '67 would start February 1, 1966, and run until August of 1967. So it's not a calendar year. It was a fiscal year basis.

So we showed you the MIMC minutes from 1968, and the end of their fiscal year was in August. That's what the evidence and the documents will show. And in those documents it does show that the board voted to abandon the site for tax purposes. They wrote off the operations of the facility for tax purposes.

It wasn't a "Are we joyous, we're leaving this site." They were merely doing what their accountants recommended and they were writing off that

facility because it was full. Nothing sinister about that by the use of the word "abandon." It was used for tax purposes and recommended by their accountants.

Now, they also seem to imply that there was something sinister about a family-run company awarding bonuses at the end of their fiscal year. We didn't see anything sinister on the screen this morning about the fact that at the end of a fiscal year that Lawrence McGinnis, the son who was the president, I think he got an 8- or a 9,000 bonus at year-end and Virgil McGinnis and others got like \$2,000 each.

Most people who are employed at the end of the fiscal year or at the end of the calendar year get bonuses. That's all those minutes reflect. Those bonuses are not shown to be tied in any way to the closure of the site that's at issue in this lawsuit.

And as you-all know, MIMC continued operating until 1994. 1968 wasn't the end of MIMC. 1966 was the end of the operation at this site, but MIMC continued in the waste disposal business until 1994. So I did not want y'all left with the impression, since I wasn't putting it up there, that there was something sinister about the 1968 minutes.

In addition, they're going to tell you that and attempted to tell you that in 1992, when the shares

of MIMC were purchased by the GCE, that MIMC made millions. MIMC didn't make millions. MIMC's stock was purchased. The stockholders in MIMC were paid for the stock of MIMC, and MIMC went to be under another corporation.

The fact of the matter is, you'll see in the records that at that point in time the two children of Virgil were the shareholders of MIMC; and they were paid for their shares in MIMC in order for the other company to purchase the shares, so that company would be under the umbrella of GCE. So nothing sinister there, either. The two individuals sold their stock; but MIMC was still operating, and still operating until 1994.

Now, I also asked myself, so why are we here about a site from 50 years ago? Why are we here? One of the reasons we're here is because after this site was closed, later in years environmental laws were passed in Texas. Those laws were not in effect at the time that this site operated.

What we're here about, too, is it's like the old waste pit lottery: Can we find billions of dollars in civil penalties for the State of Texas and Harris County? Billions of dollars they are seeking in daily penalties from 1973 to 2008.

And in listening to Harris County's

description of what they're seeking, they almost talked to you a little bit, but not completely, about the attorney's fees issue in this case. And I'm an attorney, and I'm proud to be an attorney. I know many folks don't like attorneys.

But I have to set this record straight, and the evidence is going to show this. Mr. Wotring told you that they're going to be seeking their attorney's fees for the actual time that they have spent in the amount of approximately \$10 million. And then he sort of said, "Well, and then there is more, but there is a cap."

Well, let me tell you what the "cap" is and what the "more" is. The way this case is set up is if there is a recovery of civil penalties, 50 percent of that recovery would go to the State, 50 percent of that recovery would go to the County. The attorneys for the County, who are outside counsel -- they're not government attorneys. They're an outside law firm just like I am with an outside law firm -- those attorneys have an agreement with the County where they are asking for 25 percent of any recovery the County gets, unless there is a governmental cap applied to it, which they don't think applies to them.

So at lunch I thought, well, I need to set

this straight about what the evidence is going to show and what Ms. Baker is going to testify to, because we're going to have this come out. So we've got a case where they're seeking 3.7 billion total in damages. If they get that, 1.85 billion of that would go to Harris County, less 25 percent to the attorneys.

And I wanted to run the numbers to see what is that 25 percent. That 25 percent is a potential attorney recovery of 480 million, which includes the 10 million they get on top of that for their actual time they allege they've spent. So, believe me, the attorneys have a lot invested here, 480 million potential recovery for the lawyers. So I wanted to set the record straight to say the evidence is going to show that, when Ms. Baker takes the stand about what their arrangement is with the County, and why I call this the old waste pit lottery.

Now, in the years following MIMC's waste disposal activities on the San Jacinto River, you've seen some of the pictures and heard about some of the things that happened to the land around there. We all know we live on the Gulf Coast. We all know we're in a heavily industrialized area. We're at sea level. So I'm taking you back to 1964; and you've seen this aerial photo, which you can see the site is marked out in

yellow.

Now, at that time when the facility was built, you can also see it was some distance from the San Jacinto River, which is to the right. However, in the years following the construction and use of the facility, we had things happen. We had subsidence happen and we had dredging happen. And you're going to hear a lot about dredging in this case and you're going to hear a lot about sand mining, which you'll learn all about how they go out and drag up the sand for construction projects out there.

Now, let's go back. Look at the aerial photo in 1964, and you can see the land mass. Let's go to 1974 -- '76, I'm sorry. Do you see the striping, the dredging, the sand mining operation to the right? That was a facility that sold the sand for operations.

Now let's look at an aerial photo in 1985, 20 years after the facility was in operation; and as you can see, substantial land mass and dredging has occurred in the area. So look at the difference in 1964, about the time in 1965 when Virgil McGinnis purchased the property, to 1985, 20 years after the closure of the site, what had happened to the land mass and what dredging in the area had also done to the surrounding areas.

In addition, we all know in Harris County in that area there are other industrial facilities around there. You've heard previously in the other opening statements that this waste pit of paper mill sludge from the '60s is not the only source of dioxin in the San Jacinto River.

Once again, I want to talk about why did we not have a better picture of what the County did with respect to this facility. What happened? You heard mention that the only documents relating to Dr. Quebedeaux and others were found and produced by the defendants, because Harris County's documents relating to this and other locations were destroyed in a fire in 1981.

We don't know what other materials were out there. We've gotten numerous letters showing Harris County's approval, blessing, involvement with this site. We have state documents showing their involvement and at the end in 1966 of the site, but nothing else.

And look at this timeline, ladies and gentlemen. You see, too, 20 years -- 20 years after this site was in operation is the first time the EPA names dioxin as a hazardous substance, not before then, 20 years later.

Now, you've heard about the three separate

laws; and I'm not going to go through the laws again with you. You're going to hear more about those, and in particular you're going to hear about those laws from the Judge. But I want you to remember that they're attempting to impose penalties under three separate statutes, all of which were passed long after MIMC closed its operations at this facility.

And MIMC contends that they also shouldn't be responsible for penalties in this case for the period since they closed those operations, but International Paper and MIMC are involved with the EPA in the site cleanup and remediation at the site.

You've heard the Judge read the stipulation. We're not going to stand here and tell you you should go sprinkle dioxin on your cereal. We're not standing here and saying that the right thing shouldn't be done. The right thing is being done. The right thing is being done by IP and MIMC in working with the federal government, cleaning up and remediating this site.

The right thing is not to have Harris

County and the State come in 50 years after the fact and attempt to get billions and billions in penalties, when the evidence will show they knew about this site. They knew about this site. They

from the beginning.

In 1985 did they step up? Did they say "We should all do something"? We have responsibilities. We understand that as MIMC, and that's being done with the EPA and the cleanup. And this case has nothing to do with that cleanup. This case is all about civil penalties.

So I look at this case and I have been practicing law for 35 years and I say this is really unusual. I have never had a case where I don't have a live fact witness. They're gone, and that's what happens when you wait 50 years to bring a case.

We would love to have Virgil McGinnis on the stand to talk to you about how he got involved. We would love to have Bobby Burns talk about how he and Burma Engineering built the facility. We would love to have Dr. Quebedeaux involved. We would love to have some state individuals involved who were -- saw the facility, a Mr. Stanley Thompson, an environmental investigator for the State who had looked at the site before it was shut down in 1966.

I would like to call all those people to the stand and give you the opportunity to hear from them about what happened; but because this suit was not brought until 2011, I can't do that. They're gone.

So I talked to y'all the other day a little bit about changing laws and where things stand when laws change. And I tried to think of a good example of the situation here, and I thought about a stop sign. And I thought about the fact that we all probably go to work the same way every day.

And let's say you're driving down the road in your hometown in 1966 and you're going -- you're on Main Street and at Main Street and Mockingbird there is no stop sign. You are abiding by the law. You are doing the speed limit. Your four tires are in pretty good shape. You are going through it. So you continue to drive through that intersection for nine months in 1965/1966. There is no stop sign. There is no light.

So then years later, the City puts up a stop sign and it's at the center of Main Street and Mockingbird Lane; and decades later, decades later, the City comes to you and they say, "Do you remember 45 years ago you drove through that intersection at Mockingbird and Main? Well, we're going to have to give you a ticket today; and that ticket is going to be not only for not stopping at that stop sign we put up later, that ticket is going to be because we passed a law since then, too, and by golly, you didn't have a catalytic converter on that car in 1965. We're going to give you

a ticket for that, too.

"And we have an inspection sticker requirement now, and you didn't have an inspection sticker on that car in 1965. We're going to give you a ticket for that, too; and we're going to pile those on for every day you drove through that intersection in 1965 and 1966. That's what we're going to do, even though we, who had authority to put a stop sign up there, didn't do it back then. But we've done it now; and now, after 50 years, we're going to come back and ask for \$3.8 billion from you relating to those new laws."

Well, that's what they're doing with MIMC, suing them for three separate Texas statutes that came into effect later. They're not here to clean up the site. I cannot say that often enough. The Court has told you that the parties here are participating -- the defendants here are participating in the cleanup and remediation of that site for the material with dioxin in it that nobody knew in 1965 was potentially a hazardous substance.

So I'm going to ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to listen to the evidence. You're going to listen to a lot of people who weren't there. You are going to listen to a lot of experts. You are going to

1 listen to a lot of chemical information. But I'm going to -- this is my last chance 2 3 to speak to you and ask you to listen carefully to the facts that come out on that stand and -- when you make 4 that -- you make the determination about the civil 5 penalties here, if any. But, please, I know you will 6 7 listen, you will be fair, and you'll do your best on this jury; and I appreciate your time and your 8 9 commitment to serve here. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Hinton. 11 Mr. Reasoner. 12 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. REASONER. MR. REASONER: Good afternoon. 13 14 THE JURY: Good afternoon. 15 MR. DENNIS: My name is Barrett Reasoner. I didn't get to visit with y'all during voir dire. I 16 stood up and waved. But I heard some of y'all share 17 18 experiences and the like, and I just want to introduce 19 myself. 20 Again, you met my partner, Mr. Robin Gibbs, 21 we've practiced together for over 20 years, Sydney 22 Ballesteros, my partner, and Mark Giugliano, both of whom you'll be seeing in this case. 23 24 Importantly, I want to introduce you to

Francis Chin, who is our Waste Management of Texas

25

corporate representative, who will be here over the course of the trial representing our employees.

I don't have a photo of myself to share with y'all, but that may be to your good fortune. I'll say, to orient things, I was blessed to celebrate my 50th a few months ago with my family. So that would have made me two at the time that this plant -- this impoundment stopped being used. Shortly thereafter, I would be playing with my sister in the way, way back of the station wagon as my parents drove down the freeway. So I think that the perspective that my colleagues were talking about is real important.

But I want to talk to you about how Waste Management of Texas fits into this case. It's an extremely important case to us and to our employees; and we've been looking forward to the opportunity to talk to you about and to fight this case, even though it's being brought by the Government, because we think what they're doing here is wrong. And I hope you'll see why as I go through the evidence and kind of preview it for you.

My partner, Mr. Gibbs, talked about the fact that nobody, not Harris County, nobody in this case is ever going to suggest that Waste Management of Texas had anything to do with generating this waste, selecting the location for the impoundment, constructing this site

or disposing of the waste in any way, shape, or form.

The fact is, for 37 years after MIMC stopped using this site, Waste Management of Texas had nothing to do with MIMC and it never had anything to do with the site, period. Those facts are never going to be denied by Harris County or anyone else. So the question is: Why is Waste Management of Texas being sued here?

The truth, I believe, with all due respect, that you will come to conclude after you've heard the evidence, is that they are overreaching here. The Government is trying to find another deep pocket to recover money and hoping that you, when you hear the phrase "hazardous substance," which, you know, nobody likes to hear that, let's be clear about that, and that when you hear that phrase, that you will ignore your duty to follow the facts and the law and only hold anyone accountable if you find that that's appropriate.

I submit to you that it absolutely will not be in the case of my client. The only reason that they'll say out loud that they're coming after us is because of a merger that took place in 2003, where Waste Management of Texas merged with GCE, which was a company that owned the shares of MIMC; and we'll talk about that a little bit here momentarily.

But what I want to focus on and want you to keep in your mind is what kind of case this is, and that is it's a penalties case. They are asking you -- they're saying, "Members of the jury, you punish."

That's what we want you to do. We want a penalty. We want you to punish."

To do that and for that to be appropriate, there has got to be conduct that is appropriate for punishment; and I submit to you that on this record, there is no way you can say that about us.

Waste Management of Texas could not have changed some behavior or done something differently, because we didn't come along until 2003; and the absolute truth -- the absolute truth that you're going to see from this evidence is that it was not until 2005 that Waste Management of Texas had any knowledge about the existence of this site.

If I could take you -- here is the timeline, folks, that just kind of laid out -- I know you've seen a lot of timelines. I'm going to try to move through this quickly because we're at the end of a long day.

You've heard about '65 and '66 being the time of operations, a 37-year time period until 2003; and then we've got that merger that I've talked to you

about, GCE merging with Waste Management. An important thing about that is here, when you see correspondence that took place in 2005, that's when the TCEQ is contacting -- is making contact and saying to Waste Management that "There is this site, and we believe it's connected someway to a subsidiary."

Look at what Joe Fischer at Waste

Management -- I'm just showing you this to show you what

our state of mind was there. Mr. Fischer: "I checked

further with my local field manager and others to gain

additional information whether we had ever owned the

20-acre tract of land near I-10 and the San Jacinto

River. None of the people were familiar with the site

and none of them believed we ever owned it. Good

luck..."

So that was what was going on internally when we heard from the TCEQ, no knowledge about it. We couldn't find a record of any such site. And then look at the response from the TCEQ: "Joe, thanks for the quick response. I have only recently found out that the current deed holder to the property is Virgil C.

22 McGinnis Trust. I apologize for the heartburn..."

What the TCEQ is referring to there is what Ms. Hinton has talked to you about a bit ago; and that is that it was the property -- the land was owned by

Mr. McGinnis, Virgil C. McGinnis Trust. So if you go in the property records and try to -- if you tried to look for some land owned by MIMC, it wouldn't be there. was in Mr. Virgil C. McGinnis' name under the deed records. So it's not something that showed up in any way, shape, or form within Waste Management, even when our guys are trying to look and, you know, "What property do we have? What is this about? No record of it, and understandably it couldn't be found.

But importantly, and there is the -- the McGinnis -- you've seen this before. This is the McGinnis deed.

Importantly, and you've heard this talked about, once it was confirmed that this was a property that MIMC did use all those years ago, the EPA has overseen MIMC and IP's investigation, removal, and remediation of the site. That's a process ongoing under the EPA and not to do with this case.

But what has Waste Management of Texas done? What they have done is they have provided capital contributions from one company to another to MIMC to provide all the funds that MIMC needs to participate in that EPA remediation process. So even though it's separate companies and it's a subsidiary, Waste Management of Texas has made capital contributions for

all the funds they need to do that. And this is true even though the EPA did not name Waste Management of Texas as a responsible party. So that is something that Waste Management of Texas has, nevertheless, done.

And what we are here about today -- I know it's been repeated over and over, but it's so important to keep in mind -- this is not a case about remediating or cleaning up that site and none of the funds the Government is seeking here will go to that effort, period. That is the situation, and you've heard the stipulation to that effect.

Nobody is here and Waste Management of
Texas is not here saying that hazardous waste is not
important, that there shouldn't be a cleanup effort
going on up there. We're not saying any of that.

Indeed, we're a Houston company and it's important to us
to do what we're doing. But what we cannot abide and
what is not justifiable is the Government coming after
us for a massive penalty on the facts of this case.

I want to go, if I could, for a minute into the penalty because you've heard talk about up to \$25,000 a day; but let's be real clear about that. What the Government is doing here is they are trying to collect under multiple statutes.

You heard Mr. Carter identify the statutes,

three different statutes for you. They are saying: We want to collect for the same act -- the same actions under all three of these statutes. So multiply your 25,000 a day times three.

And then they're saying: Well, this one site, well, that's -- they're different compartments. So it's really multiple sites. So let's multiply the 25,000 more again.

So what they're really seeking here, even as to my client alone, is over a hundred thousand dollars a day. That is how you get -- that's how they have done the gyrations to get to this multi-billion-dollar claim that they're here before you pursuing. I think that -- I think that and the facts and the law that you are going to hear speak for itself and I don't need to elaborate on that.

But I have talked about Waste Management's lack of involvement during the real time; and when I say that, "the real time" is a phrase. And I hope I'm not annoying you; but what I mean is when you look before litigation, you look at what people were saying in documents, what they were doing during the actual events, what were they saying in the real time.

And here, you've already heard at some length about the County's involvement. I won't belabor

that with you because you've gone through it. But Dr. Quebedeaux's involvement, the approval of the site and the equipment, referring to that as ideal, all of that is critically important; but I think it has been well covered by the other lawyers here. But it's critically important at the front end that Harris County was involved thoroughly and completely in it.

But what I want to cover with you now is the fact that it did not stop there, okay. Harris County's involvement did not stop there.

Directly next door to the impoundments was land owned and operated by a fellow -- operated by a fellow named Captain Jack Roberts, you'll hear in the evidence. And Captain Jack Roberts, starting in the mid-1970s, applied for and received permits for dredging. That was the business. It was a sand mining business, and he applied for and received permits to dredge.

And if you look here, we've got Exhibit -I cant read the number from here, but it will be
presented to you repeatedly. And it is the dredging
application for Captain Jack; and look here, this is
critically important. It shows the area that is to be
dredged. And we have marked -- if I may approach, Your
Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. REASONER: And now at close range, I can tell you it is Exhibit 1240. But this is the permit application and an attachment to it. We have blown up the attachment sheet. This is the area to be dredged. And look at this yellow arrow saying "McGinnis," okay. So that's -- that's -- the site right there was surrounded in all respects by the dredging application area.

Now, you're going to hear from experts,

Mr. Bob Zoch, an engineer, and we're also going to call

Dr. Mark Johns who will explain what dredging is. And
this is not actually Captain Jack's dredging machine,
but it's just a dramatization there to show you how this
works.

But you've got hydraulic equipment with blades that go down into and can be raised and goes down that way, carves into whatever the soil is and then sucks up the sand. So as you can see, it's an extremely strong, rough, disruptive piece of equipment; and what you'll hear is that millions of cubic yards of sand were dredged.

Now, I want to take you through the process of how Captain Jack got this permit because it's critically important. If you look at the public notice

sent in January of 1991 -- here you have an application for 8.7 million cubic yards of sand. And this is the Army Corp of Engineers. They're involved in the permitting process.

And what they do is they give a public notice and they say, "We are soliciting comments from the public, federal, state, local agencies and officials." They let people who might be interested to know that "We've got this application; and we want you to comment on whether you object to this dredging application, any comments you have pro or con." That's what that is.

But here is what is very interesting. If you look at the third page, there is a list of addressees -- actually, I say the third. It's the third slide. But there is a list of folks who got that, who received this notice; and right there is the County Judge of Harris County.

Now, Mr. Wotring, in his opening statement talked about the fact that that is not a judge like Judge Baker, that is the head county official; and I'm sure y'all have known that or run across that along the way here in Harris County.

So look here (indicating). We have another public notice in 1996. Again, you see an area -- we've

got Phase 1 and Phase 2 and then the freeway and, again, the impoundment area. So right around it again we have applications from Captain Jack for dredging rights.

So who else got a copy again? The County

Judge of Harris County, and you see the address there on

Preston on the list of addressees who received it.

Now, remember, in talking about our timeline as we have now a lot of the day, remember that Harris County knows about that impoundment. Remember, Dr. Quebedeaux approved the site, talked about the equipment, talked about the methods to be used, et cetera, so they knew that was there.

I want to tell you -- why am I talking about this dredging issue? There are two reasons.

Before I go any further, I want to make that real clear.

There are two reasons that are very important.

One is if somebody else comes in and dredges into a site or an impoundment and causes a release of a hazardous substance, that dredger or that third party who is doing that is causing the release of that substance. Remember Mr. Carter was talking to you about "cause, suffer, and allow." You look at what the cause was. Causation is the concept that the Court is going to talk to you about at the end. This is why this is important that this dredging went on around the site

and ultimately, you'll see, on the site.

But why else? I'm asking you to look at the conduct of Harris County here, as you evaluate the reasonableness of the defendants' conduct, okay.

They are bringing a penalty case, saying we should be punished. That's their case. You can look at what the County and the State did in the circumstances when you are evaluating the defendants' conduct. You are looking at what is reasonable. Look at what they thought was reasonable during the real time.

A number of organizations did raise objections to these dredging applications. The evidence will show you that Harris County did not. They did not say anything. Even though they received full plans in these notices, Harris County made no objection to the permit applications.

And you'll hear testimony. Mr. Allen, in his deposition, Mr. Allen who is here with the County Pollution Department:

"And does Harris County have the opportunity to object to proposed dredging?"

With notice, you have an opportunity" --

"ANSWER: With notice, you have an opportunity to comment -- and 'comments' means objections, I guess. Yes.

QUESTION: Has Harris County in the past objected to dredging in certain areas in Harris County?

ANSWER: Yes."

So it's something they knew they had a right to do and they have done at various times in the past. In this situation, in spite of having knowledge on the front end about the impoundment and knowledge about the application to dredge, they did not. They made no -- no comment, no objection, no statement. That was their conduct in the real time.

Look at, please, what -- the next exhibit as to TCEQ, the other party here that is, again, a nominal party. They are part of this. They are seeking a half of the funds and attorney's fees, as has been discussed.

Texas Parks & Wildlife Department writes a letter to the TCEQ, and you see that they have noticed dredging -- they've become aware of information that suggests there are old waste pits in a sand bar in the San Jacinto River just north. So they have -- the Parks & Wildlife Department is saying, "We have discovered that there appear to be old waste pits there."

Look at the next page of this letter that's written to TCEQ: "The potential presence of sediment contamination is an immediate concern as the San Jacinto

River near the I-10 bridge is very active with respect to dredging, mining and construction. These activities may be spreading potentially contaminated sediments or resuspending dioxins in the water column."

They are concerned about dredging, and they're telling TCEQ about this in 2005.

Look at the last page of this document.

They note -- they talk about sand mining and processing and they say it envelopes -- envelopes the suspected waste site all around it. That's what TCEQ is hearing from Texas Department of Wildlife.

What happened next, again, as you're evaluating the reasonableness of conduct, the TCEQ, which works with the Army Corp of Engineers, coordinates with them on these permits, did nothing for three years. For three years after receiving this information from the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, the TCEQ did nothing.

And, indeed, if you look here at the next slide, they were -- they actually -- his -- Captain Jack's permit was even extended until December 27th of 2007. So in spite of this information having been brought to the TCEQ's attention, they allowed, without objection, the permit to be extended for Captain Jack on the dredging.

Finally, three years later, October 29th of 2008, you find that they make an objection here. And they say... "encouraging the Corp" -- the bolded language there, they encouraged the Corp to revoke or suspend the permit for dredging. So three years later

Now, the evidence will show you -- and, again, this is something that the experts will be able to cover with you better, but I want to preview it for you. And there is just -- the Corp of Engineer has, in fact, ultimately -- ultimately decided to suspend the dredging permit.

But I want you to look at with me just briefly -- and these can be blown up individually. We compare 1995, an aerial photo -- and we've circled in yellow, you see the northwest corner of the impoundment, a smooth around the edge there.

Now look in 1997 the situation. You can see that, and experts will testify about that, tell-tale signs of dredging, including a huge chunk taken out of the northwest corner of the impoundment. So you will hear expert testimony about the fact that this is indicative of dredging actually penetrating into this impoundment.

And that is something that Harris County

they took action.

today may be denying in this trial; but I remind you, and you saw these exhibits with Mr. Carter, I remind you in the real time that Mr. Rock Owens in his -- the exhibit we saw said it looked like, remember, it looked like a large portion of one of the cells was dredged Mr. Owens knew what he was looking at at that time; and, again, that's the chief environmental attorney the County.

Also remember the Texas Parks & Wildlife
Department, remember what they said in 2005. I can't
ever pronounce his name. People do it differently.

"Sipocz" perhaps, but a gentleman with the Texas Parks &
Wildlife. Again, Mr. Carter showed you this: "... I
believe more firmly that... mining was responsible for
the increase in dioxin levels from '94 to 2002." Two
separate sources, real time information about what they
thought was causing this release, okay.

Now, you're going to hear a different tune from them during this trial; but I ask you in your role as fact finders and judges of credibility to judge what you believe to be more credible in that regard.

Just so our timeline is in mind, I'll repeat it but it's important, it wasn't until 2003 -- this is all before Waste Management of Texas is in any way on the scene.

Dr. Johns will also, just to preview that testimony for you a bit more and I'll move on, but he will indicate to you also that the dredging in the northwest corner, that you can see that it was -- that there was sand moved over to the opposite bank where there was a mining property, Big Sky -- excuse me, Big Star Mining, you'll hear evidence about that, and that there was, indeed, dioxin -- high concentrations of dioxin over there that could be traced to the site, in his opinion.

Now, when you listen -- you're going to listen to experts from both sides; but I want you to keep in mind when you hear from the experts that the County is going to put forward on these issues, they were not told -- they have testified that they were not told in any way, shape, or form about dredging, did not include that in their analysis. When they did their analysis to try to determine whether there was a release, you'll hear them -- you'll hear them admit that the County's attorneys and personnel did not tell them about dredging and did not ask them to consider it in any way, shape, or form.

I expect that under cross-examination, they will have to admit -- even they, as experts for the County, will have to admit that dredging could have

caused a release of this -- of this substance; and although it's not really our area of focus in the case, I also want to ask you to focus on what those experts are and are not saying. They have -- as you heard, a daily release of dioxin is what they are trying to prove to you here. And the Judge, I believe, will instruct you that to get a penalty on a day, you have to show that there was a release that day. That's what they're trying to do, is to show that there was a release of this hazardous substance every day over a period of decades.

But listen carefully to their experts, because these gentleman, Mr. Bedient and Mr. Pardue, will not be able to tell you, I expect, how dioxin supposedly got out on a given day, how much got out, how it was transported on a day, how much was there in the beginning and how much remains, absolutely imprecise in terms of what they are trying to tell you and trying to prove is daily release; but that has not stopped the County for asking for a massive penalty on the basis of their testimony.

I want to talk to you just a bit more about Waste Management of Texas and how the County is trying to come up with a way to connect us with these events and hold us liable for these events. I believe that

you'll -- you will find that there is not a real connection or not a legal connection that they can rely on there.

Opposing counsel spoke for over an hour and spoke very eloquently, but he spoke very little about Waste Management of Texas, and for good reason. Chuck Rivette is our corporate representative. You're going to hear from Mr. Rivette. He is going to tell you that Waste Management of Texas has been operating since the '70s. It's a Houston-based company. I think Mr. Gibbs talked to you a little bit about it, about trash collection, recycling, landfill operations.

And Mr. Rivette will also explain that it's a grassroots-based operation, in that when Waste Management of Texas has acquired some subsidiaries over the years, they leave those in place because it's a very -- this sort of waste handling, the waste management business is a community-by-community situation. So they keep subsidiaries in place that deal directly with the community in place.

He's not going to know much of anything. He's not going to know anything about the site, other than what he's heard here and what he heard when -- in 2005, period; but, obviously, that's not something to hold against him, since the fact that we weren't around

at that time.

We believe that the only evidence that the County is going to rely on is this 2003 merger. I'm sure it's a term y'all -- y'all read about and are familiar with. You know, it's like a marriage between two companies.

The County wants to sort of blur the lines of who merged with whom here. It's important to keep in mind that it was Waste Management merging with GCE, okay, not MIMC. MIMC has at all times remained its separate company; and they, again, are represented by Ms. Hinton here today.

You heard from her very -- I think very well-stated why MIMC should not be liable and that the evidence is going to support that; but also -- what you are also going to have to deal with, is the County's argument that because Waste Management of Texas merged with GCE, who owned MIMC, that somehow that makes Waste Management of Texas liable or responsible for all of MIMC or any other subsidiary's actions through the years. That's not accurate, and nor is it fair.

A couple of things to keep in mind there.

Number one, this is a penalty case. I have talked about that. You are evaluating whether somebody has done anything that is worthy of a penalty. It is impossible

to seriously say Waste Management of Texas should be penalized for something that took place that it had no control over, no part in, had no knowledge of.

Second, to get a finding, to obtain these large penalties they want, they need to show that Waste Management of Texas did something wrong with respect to the site. Just saying that you own shares is not enough. That is not the way our system works or the way it is set up.

So let's look at what the County says.

What is the evidence that the County is relying on? You saw the two documents in opposing counsel's opening argument. There are two documents, and they say -- I want to look at both of them with you briefly. They say very little, okay.

What they do not say is anything about dioxin, anything about harmful waste or toxins or waste even being from a paper mill or waste being released.

These two documents they rely on say nothing of that sort. They simply mention the site.

Let's go to the documents specifically.

Here is the 1992 letter to Mr. Fatjo that opposing

counsel talked about. Let's look at that.

First of all, one thing that didn't come up in counsel's talk is that's a 50-page document, okay.

So -- and this is on -- the item that he highlighted for you is on Page 42 of that 50-page document.

And this is from back in 1992, okay. So it's 11 years before Waste Management of Texas is on the scene. But, again, if you look at this language, it says the company owns land located adjacent to the San Jacinto River which was used for certain waste disposal activities, completely general; doesn't tell you anything about any hazard, any dioxin, any paper waste, anything of that sort.

It says there is no pending or threatened liabilities; and then at the end there is just kind of some lawyer catch-all language that says, "Due to the expansive nature of environmental laws" -- of course, there can always be something, okay. That's all that document says, and I encourage you to look closely at that.

There is nothing there to alert anyone who looked at it -- assuming that somebody at GCE, you know, looked at Page 42, that's not something that somebody would say, "Oh, my gosh, you know, we need -- this is a crisis. We need to go find out what this is and what this is all about." That's not the kind of document that is, in any way, shape, or form.

Look at the other document he relies on,

the 1968 MIMC board minutes. Again, Ms. Hinton talked about that at some length with you; but I want to focus you in. And I apologize. This is an old document.

But if you look -- it's sort of faint, but we don't have better copies of it. But, again, it's referring to, you know, real estate on the San Jacinto River which was used as a dump for waste material hauled by the corporation. So look closely at that language, as well. No mention of paper waste, dioxin, hazards, release, anything like that.

Somebody who is looking at that in 2003 would have no reason to see that, or in '92 for that matter, would have no reason to see it and say, you know, "Oh, my gosh, this is -- this was a problem. We need to go look at that. "It just refers to a site that was used by this point decades earlier; and that's it, okay.

Those are the -- those are the two documents that this entire -- against my clients, a hundreds of millions of dollars case rests on, okay.

And, again, you can look at the knowledge and the conduct of the County when you look at what we did and evaluate the reasonableness of the conduct and evaluate our conduct.

With perfect knowledge, with the County

having knowledge on the front end and the County having knowledge along the way about dredging applications, with all of the knowledge they have, they are here asking you, as a jury, to award against my client hundreds of millions of dollars and against the group billions of dollars. And against us the case is, well, somebody really should have -- in a merger somebody should have dug up these documents, seen that reference, jumped to a conclusion that there could potentially be some serious situation, gone out, found it, investigated. When you follow the logic, when you look at

When you follow the logic, when you look at what they're saying we should have done and what the liability rests on, that they are trying to bring against us, it really stretches the imagination to the breaking point. And we very much feel strongly about that, and we very much look forward to presenting the evidence to you.

I appreciate your patience late in the afternoon, and thank you very much for your service.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Reasoner.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, as we discussed, we're going to break for the day and start with our first witness in the morning. We have some other work we can do, and we'll let you go home. So

```
y'all have a good evening, and we'll see you in the
 1
   morning ready to start up at 9:30.
 2
 3
                  (Evening recess)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# THE STATE OF TEXAS COUNTY OF HARRIS

I, Kimberly Kidd, Official Court Reporter in and for the 295th District Court of Harris County, State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains a true and correct daily copy transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

I further certify that this Reporter's Record of the proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any, admitted, tendered in an offer of proof or offered into evidence.

WITNESS my hand this the 16th day of October, 2014.

/s/ Kimberly Kidd
Kimberly Kidd, Texas CSR No. 2437
Expiration Date: 12/31/15
Official Court Reporter
295th District Court
Harris County, Texas
201 Caroline, 14th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

(713) 368-6453

		-		-
\$	<b>1.85</b> [1] - 107:5	98:6, 98:9, 98:12,	<b>1991</b> [1] - 124:1	3:22
Ψ	<b>1/4</b> [1] - 11:13	99:2, 99:19, 102:5,	<b>1992</b> [12] - 32:1, 33:13,	<b>24</b> [1] - 23:14
<b>\$1</b> [1] - 30:5	<b>10</b> [9] - 34:14, 38:24,	108:21, 112:25,	34:3, 34:12, 35:15,	<b>2437</b> [1] - 140:21
<b>\$1.591</b> [2] - 49:22,	68:13, 69:11, 81:5,	113:4, 113:7, 113:20	36:16, 36:21, 40:1,	<b>25</b> [4] - 106:22, 107:6,
49:23	81:6, 82:16, 84:20,	<b>1965/1966</b> [1] - 112:14	41:12, 104:25,	107:8
	107:9	<b>1966</b> [29] - 26:4, 26:15,	135:22, 136:3	<b>25,000</b> [2] - 121:4,
<b>\$10</b> [2] - 50:4, 106:10		26:23, 27:11, 27:12,	· ·	
<b>\$10,000</b> [1] - 49:5	10-year-old [1] - 88:8		<b>1993</b> [1] - 35:17	121:8
<b>\$2,000</b> [1] - 104:11	<b>1000</b> [1] - 3:15	28:16, 29:14, 45:24,	<b>1994</b> [6] - 37:7, 81:17,	<b>25TH</b> [1] - 4:6
<b>\$25,000</b> [9] - 15:24,	<b>1019</b> [1] - 2:12	56:5, 56:9, 57:4,	85:24, 104:18,	<b>25th</b> [3] - 14:8, 17:10,
16:4, 40:12, 48:10,	<b>104</b> [4] - 33:8, 33:9,	65:11, 68:6, 69:10,	104:20, 105:13	20:8
48:13, 49:2, 49:4,	78:17, 79:11	72:14, 73:14, 75:17,	<b>1995</b> [2] - 51:17,	<b>27th</b> [2] - 23:8, 128:21
49:17, 120:22	<b>1050</b> [1] - 3:21	76:12, 83:2, 83:23,	129:15	<b>28</b> [1] - 24:12
<b>\$5,000</b> [1] - 49:5	<b>10th</b> [2] - 99:7, 102:5	87:14, 102:5, 102:8,	<b>1996</b> [1] - 124:25	28th [2] - 22:7, 23:16
<b>\$50</b> [7] - 15:23, 16:2,	<b>11</b> [1] - 136:4	103:14, 104:19,	<b>1997</b> [1] - 129:18	<b>295th</b> [2] - 140:4,
40:12, 48:10, 48:13,	<b>1100</b> [1] - 3:6	109:19, 111:21,	<b>19th</b> [3] - 29:3, 29:6,	140:23
49:1, 49:17	<b>1111</b> [1] - 4:6	112:8, 113:7	96:21	295TH [1] - 1:11
<b>\$50,000</b> [1] - 30:4	<b>11th</b> [5] - 14:7, 18:16,	<b>1967</b> [3] - 29:14,		29th [2] - 93:8, 129:1
<b>\$698</b> [1] - 49:24	20:8, 22:24, 73:17	86:21, 103:15	2	<b>2:00</b> [1] - 84:20
	<b>12/31/15</b> [1] - 140:22	<b>1968</b> [12] - 29:3, 29:6,	_	
ı	<b>1240</b> [1] - 123:3	29:9, 30:7, 30:20,	<b>2</b> [3] - 19:2, 90:1,	3
		30:22, 32:1, 103:11,	125:1	<u> </u>
<b>'30s</b> [1] - 97:8	12548 [1] - 2:19	103:18, 104:18,	<b>20</b> [15] - 45:11, 66:3,	<b>3</b> [1] - 11:13
<b>'40s</b> [1] - 97:9	13th [1] - 99:18	104:23, 137:1	67:22, 67:23, 67:24,	<b>3.7</b> [1] - 107:4
	<b>14.05</b> [2] - 45:10,	<b>1970</b> [2] - 31:11, 31:13	75:12, 82:17, 94:17,	
<b>'54</b> [1] - 64:12	47:13	<b>1970s</b> [1] - 31:24	98:24, 108:18,	<b>3.8</b> [1] - 113:11
<b>'60s</b> [5] - 64:9, 81:4,	<b>14th</b> [6] - 26:4, 26:15,	<b>1970s</b> [i] - 31.24 <b>1971</b> [i] - 21:6	108:22, 109:21,	<b>30</b> [1] - 98:24
86:17, 86:18, 109:5	26:23, 27:11, 28:16,			<b>30th</b> [5] - 24:6, 34:3,
<b>'65</b> [8] - 21:17, 21:18,	140:24	<b>1973</b> [18] - 38:23,	109:24, 114:21	38:23, 44:14, 44:19
42:14, 63:11, 63:16,	<b>15</b> [1] - 56:16	44:14, 44:18, 45:10,	<b>20-acre</b> [4] - 94:1,	<b>31</b> [3] - 30:7, 98:9,
64:22, 93:9, 117:23	<b>15TH</b> [1] - 2:12	45:12, 45:14, 50:20,	94:8, 98:2, 118:12	98:12
<b>'66</b> [5] - 42:14, 63:11,	<b>15th</b> [5] - 38:23, 44:13,	51:15, 56:7, 56:16,	<b>20-plus</b> [1] - 76:14	<b>31st</b> [1] - 65:23
64:22, 79:8, 117:23	44:18, 51:15, 65:23	56:22, 65:11, 65:23,	<b>2000</b> [2] - 13:2, 61:4	<b>35</b> [10] - 16:8, 16:14,
<b>'67</b> [1] - 103:13	<b>16</b> [2] - 1:15, 5:1	82:15, 83:3, 84:7,	<b>2001</b> [1] - 37:21	20:6, 40:4, 41:5,
<b>'70s</b> [5] - 51:1, 80:9,	<b>16th</b> [3] - 1:18, 99:19,	84:8, 105:24	<b>2002</b> [2] - 81:17,	45:13, 47:1, 49:10,
80:14, 80:21, 133:10	140:17	<b>1974</b> [2] - 51:2, 108:14	130:15	51:18, 111:9
<b>'73</b> [1] - 83:5	<b>17th</b> [1] - 90:8	<b>1975</b> [7] - 65:13,	<b>2003</b> [11] - 36:17,	<b>35-year</b> [1] - 46:8
<b>'76</b> [2] - 75:4, 108:14	<b>19</b> [1] - 50:3	65:23, 68:12, 68:18,	36:19, 37:4, 41:22,	<b>368-6453</b> [1] - 140:25
<b>'78</b> [1] - 75:4	<b>1907</b> [1] - 96:25	82:15, 83:3	42:3, 116:22,	<b>37</b> [1] - 116:2
<b>'80s</b> [4] - 76:14, 78:12,	<b>1946</b> [1] - 96.25	<b>1976</b> [1] - 75:9	117:13, 117:24,	<b>37-year</b> [1] - 117:24
81:5	• •	<b>1978</b> [4] - 51:6, 51:7,	130:23, 134:3,	3rd [2] - 98:5, 98:6
<b>'85</b> [1] - 84:5	<b>1953</b> [1] - 75:9	51:13, 57:24	137:11	J. u [2] - JU.J, JU.U
<b>'90s</b> [2] - 51:1, 79:12	<b>1954</b> [1] - 64:12	<b>1979</b> [1] - 51:13	<b>20036-5306</b> [1] - 3:22	А
	<b>1960's</b> [2] - 61:20,	<b>1980</b> [1] - 41:2	<b>2005</b> [8] - 38:13,	4
<b>'91</b> [1] - 36:3	62:6	<b>1980s</b> [2] - 14:17,	51:17, 81:14,	<b>4</b> [1] - 12:4
<b>'92</b> [2] - 36:3, 137:12	<b>1960s</b> [1] - 97:6	76:11	117:15, 118:3,	<b>40</b> [2] - 14:15, 99:1
<b>'94</b> [2] - 35:17, 130:15	<b>1962</b> [1] - 50:17	<b>1981</b> [4] - 51:13, 73:6,	128:6, 130:10,	
<b>'95</b> [1] - 35:18	<b>1964</b> [8] - 16:17,	73:9, 109:14	133:24	<b>4000</b> [1] - 3:15
'because [1] - 26:9	63:13, 64:21, 86:21,	<b>1983</b> [1] - 78:23	<b>2007</b> [1] - 128:22	<b>42</b> [2] - 136:2, 136:20
'comments' [1] -	87:25, 107:24,		<b>2007</b> [1] - 128.22 <b>2008</b> [12] - 9:6, 9:8,	<b>44</b> [1] - 89:7
126:24	108:13, 108:20	<b>1985</b> [21] - 9:25, 14:16,		<b>45</b> [1] - 112:19
'waste [1] - 23:4	<b>1965</b> [47] - 14:8, 20:8,	14:21, 32:8, 38:17,	10:4, 35:19, 37:5,	<b>480</b> [2] - 107:9, 107:12
	22:7, 22:24, 23:8,	39:18, 41:1, 51:17,	38:21, 38:23, 44:14,	
/	24:6, 24:12, 33:13,	65:12, 66:1, 66:2,	44:19, 82:25,	5
	36:12, 56:5, 57:3,	67:22, 67:24, 68:5,	105:24, 129:2	
/s [1] - 140:21	57:7, 64:2, 64:12,	76:10, 79:1, 79:9,	<b>201</b> [1] - 140:24	<b>5</b> [6] - 32:19, 33:7,
	64:14, 65:11, 73:17,	82:17, 108:17,	<b>2011</b> [6] - 50:3, 50:12,	33:10, 78:17, 78:25,
1	74:1, 76:11, 79:8,	108:22, 111:2	61:23, 82:24, 83:1,	79:2
•	87:14, 87:21, 88:4,	<b>1988</b> [5] - 32:9, 32:19,	111:25	5-mill [1] - 79:1
<b>1</b> [8] - 1:1, 69:9, 69:10,	89:4, 89:9, 89:12,	32:23, 32:24, 39:20	<b>2011-76724</b> [1] - 1:2	<b>50</b> [14] - 58:2, 59:9,
90:1, 102:8, 103:14,	89:18, 89:24, 90:8,	<b>1988/89</b> [1] - 33:10	<b>2014</b> [4] - 1:15, 1:18,	61:23, 64:18, 84:12,
125:1	92:18, 93:8, 93:19,	<b>1989</b> [4] - 45:10, 47:5,	5:1, 140:18	84:13, 86:3, 105:15,
<b>1.6</b> [1] - 59:9		47:10, 47:13	202.955.8500 [1] -	106:15, 106:16,
110 (1) 0010	94:20, 96:21, 98:5,	1	• •	

110:22, 111:12, 113:10

50-page [2] - 135:25, 136:2

50th [1] - 115:6

512-463.2012 [1] -2:20

5300 [1] - 3:6

58-year-old [1] - 96:23

5:00 [2] - 59:14, 59:24

5:15 [1] - 23:9

5th [1] - 57:7

#### 6

**60-mile-an-hour** [1] - 67:2 **600** [1] - 2:5

#### 7

7 [2] - 56:7, 82:15 70[1] - 67:1 700 [1] - 2:5 713 [1] - 140:25 **713.650.8805** [1] - 3:7 **713.651.2663** [1] - 4:7 713.755.7880 [1] -2:13 713.890.5000 [1] -3:16 713.980.1713 [1] - 2:6 73 [7] - 16:19, 18:22, 23:2, 73:20, 87:6, 94:2, 95:21 77002 [5] - 2:6, 2:12, 3:6, 3:16, 140:24 77002-5242 [1] - 4:6 78711-2548 [1] - 2:19

## 8

**8**<sub>[1]</sub> - 104:10 **8.7**<sub>[1]</sub> - 124:2

## 9

**9** [2] - 82:16, 87:11 **9,000** [1] - 104:10 **9:30** [1] - 139:2

#### Α

abandon [4] - 28:18, 39:14, 103:21, 104:2 abandoned [6] -14:14, 30:15, 32:3, 42:16, 102:17, 102:24 abandoning [1] -

30:20 abate [1] - 49:13 abide [1] - 120:17 abiding [1] - 112:10 able [10] - 10:15, 20:10, 33:16, 45:16, 45:18, 69:17, 83:24, 84:1, 129:8, 132:14 above-entitled [1] -1:18 above-styled [1] -140:10 absolute [2] - 117:14 absolutely [2] -116:19, 132:17 acceptable [2] -20:21, 93:23 access [2] - 21:4, 31:9 accident [2] - 59:17, 59:23 according [4] - 56:16, 62:24, 65:10, 96:9 accordingly [1] - 35:4 accountable [1] -116:18 accountant [1] - 99:3 accountants [2] -103:25, 104:3 accounts [1] - 97:24 accrued [1] - 35:5 accurate [1] - 134:21 accused [1] - 84:4 acknowledges [1] -77:12 acquired [1] - 133:15 acres [3] - 45:10, 45:11, 94:17 act [1] - 121:2 Act [16] - 48:2, 48:19, 49:12, 65:11, 65:13, 65:24, 65:25, 66:5, 66:6, 67:24, 68:11, 68:12, 69:11, 70:13 acting [1] - 1:5 action [6] - 11:21, 23:19, 27:3, 30:5, 35:4, 129:6 actions [3] - 49:13, 121:2, 134:20 active [1] - 128:1 activities [8] - 30:14, 34:16, 64:16, 72:25, 81:7, 107:19, 128:2, 136:8 activity [4] - 70:16, 70:21, 82:15, 90:11 acts [1] - 67:20 actual [5] - 6:8, 54:17,

106:9, 107:10,

121:22

addition [4] - 68:15, 70:13, 104:24, 109:1 additional [3] - 5:6, 6:8. 118:11 address [3] - 10:16, 12:21, 125:5 addressees [2] -124:15, 125:6 adhere [1] - 20:24 adjacent [4] - 34:13, 48:23, 48:25, 136:6 administer [1] - 8:7 administrative [2] -35:3, 99:3 admission [1] - 80:20 admissions [1] -55:24 admit [3] - 131:19, 131:24, 131:25 admits [2] - 78:5, 103:5 admitted [3] - 27:5, 72:15, 140:15 admittedly [1] - 57:4 adult [1] - 97:6 advocates [1] - 6:25 aerial [15] - 11:12, 11:15, 11:17, 11:19, 16:17, 31:18, 31:21, 31:22, 31:25, 50:15, 50:16, 107:24, 108:12, 108:17, 129:15 affairs [1] - 86:10 affect [1] - 80:25 affected [1] - 26:1 afraid [1] - 33:15 afternoon [8] - 55:21, 55:22, 66:23, 85:3, 85:4, 114:13, 114:14, 138:20 afterwards [1] - 58:2 agencies [4] - 11:17, 11:24, 92:9, 124:7 Agency [1] - 9:7 agency [2] - 53:8, 53:12 agents [1] - 20:23 ago [8] - 84:13, 88:20, 90:2, 105:15, 112:19, 115:6, 118:24, 119:15 agreed [4] - 14:16, 17:3, 32:6 agreement [4] - 9:1, 34:6, 70:5, 106:21 ahead [3] - 28:16, 28:17, 84:19 air [2] - 47:24, 75:10

**Alabama** [3] - 88:5,

88:11, 89:21 alert [1] - 136:18 allege [1] - 107:11 Allen [9] - 12:11, 12:13, 17:14, 75:11, 75:18, 76:18, 88:7, 126:17, 126:18 allow [17] - 15:13, 15:20, 17:7, 18:4, 19:5, 21:23, 23:6, 24:2, 44:1, 48:8, 48:20, 68:17, 68:20, 68:25, 69:14, 70:15, 125:22 allowed [8] - 40:11, 41:6, 42:2, 43:19, 52:24, 54:5, 65:20, 128:23 allowing [1] - 40:14 almost [5] - 18:14, 31:22, 66:3, 69:10, 106:1 alone [1] - 121:10 Alvin [1] - 97:18 **AMANDES** [1] - 3:18 amazing [1] - 89:10 amount [6] - 48:16, 49:23, 50:6, 50:8, 54:7, 106:10 amounts [1] - 78:14 analysis [2] - 131:17, 131:18 **AND** [4] - 1:10, 2:10, 3:4, 3:20 Andrew [1] - 81:12 annoyed [1] - 7:2 **annoying** [1] - 121:20 answer [2] - 6:3, 6:9 ANSWER [4] - 71:6, 71:20, 126:23, 127:3 answers [2] - 6:17, 83:25 **ANTHONY** [2] - 2:21, anticipate [2] - 53:15, 53:19 anyway [1] - 92:14 **apart** [1] - 95:2 apologize [2] -118:22, 137:3 appear [1] - 127:22 appearing [1] - 90:5 application [7] -122:22, 123:4, 123:8, 124:1, 124:9, 124:11, 127:8 applications [4] -125:3, 126:12, 126:16, 138:2 applied [3] - 106:23,

122:15, 122:17 applies [1] - 106:24 apply [2] - 5:7, 82:2 appreciate [3] - 51:23, 114:8, 138:19 approach [3] - 6:20, 17:16, 122:24 appropriate [3] -116:18, 117:7, 117:8 approval [12] - 21:20, 23:4, 57:4, 57:7, 57:15, 62:18, 62:23, 64:1, 65:16, 73:11, 109:17, 122:2 approvals [1] - 91:23 approved [17] - 23:3, 30:10, 61:18, 63:5, 63:23, 64:8, 72:19, 74:2, 75:2, 76:3, 83:15, 84:11, 94:14, 94:15, 102:19, 102:20, 125:10 approves [1] - 73:16 approving [4] - 57:12, 74:16, 75:15, 92:19 **April** [1] - 93:8 area [30] - 16:23, 16:24, 31:19, 31:20, 43:6, 63:19, 77:5, 80:4, 80:7, 81:2, 81:6, 87:22, 90:15, 91:10, 94:9, 96:25, 97:11, 97:16, 97:20, 100:5, 107:23, 108:20, 108:24, 109:2, 122:23, 123:5, 123:9, 124:25, 125:2, 132:2 areas [2] - 108:25, 127:2 argument [4] - 6:13, 57:20, 134:17, 135:13 arguments [1] - 6:10 arm [1] - 65:3 **Army** [2] - 124:3, 128:14 arrangement [1] -107:16 arrow [1] - 123:6 articles [1] - 98:20 aspect [1] - 72:19 assessed [4] - 9:18, 27:23, 60:17, 75:25 asset [1] - 30:3 assigned [1] - 99:10 **assimilate** [1] - 36:10 assistance [1] - 96:2 ASSISTANT [2] - 2:14, 2:22

assistant [4] - 52:16, 54:10, 54:17, 99:4 assistants [1] - 12:17 assisted [1] - 1:21 associated [1] - 62:11 assumed [1] - 21:14 assuming [1] - 136:19 Astrodome [5] -89:18, 89:20, 89:24, 89:25, 90:7 astronomically [1] -38:14 attached [1] - 24:11 attachment [2] -123:4, 123:5 attempt [3] - 97:25, 102:23, 110:23 attempted [1] - 104:25 attempting [1] - 110:5 attending [2] - 12:10, 12:13 attention [2] - 84:15, 128:23 attorney [12] - 12:18, 13:11, 13:15, 38:6, 52:16, 54:10, 54:11, 54:18, 106:4, 107:9, 130:8 **ATTORNEY** [4] - 2:11, 2:14, 2:18, 2:22 Attorney [2] - 12:2, 52:17 attorney's [8] - 50:3, 53:22, 53:25, 54:3, 54:13, 106:3, 106:8, 127:14 attorneys [11] - 6:1, 6:19, 6:24, 8:13, 106:5, 106:17, 106:19, 106:20, 107:6, 107:12, 131:20 audited [1] - 35:5 auditors [2] - 29:17, 30:2 August [13] - 29:3, 29:6, 29:8, 30:7, 30:19, 86:21, 96:21, 98:5, 98:6, 98:9, 98:12, 103:14, 103:18 Austin [1] - 86:8 **AUSTIN** [1] - 2:19 **authority** [1] - 113:8 **AVENUE** [1] - 3:21 award [2] - 49:21, 138:4 awarded [1] - 53:7 **awarding** [1] - 104:5 aware [1] - 127:18

В **B.S** [1] - 75:7 baby [2] - 87:24, 87:25 backed [1] - 59:16 Baker [10] - 1:19, 50:9, 58:16, 58:22, 59:20, 68:23, 70:19, 107:2, 107:15, 124:21 **BAKER** [2] - 2:4, 2:8 7:12 Baker's [1] - 60:20 **balance** [1] - 30:6 BALLESTEROS [1] -3:10 Ballesteros [1] -114:22 bank [5] - 18:21, 23:1, 73:19, 95:20, 131:5 bankruptcy [2] - 96:18 96:9 bar [1] - 127:19 barge [6] - 17:1, 100:22, 101:14, 101:16, 101:21 barges [3] - 42:22, 100:14, 100:16 barging [1] - 21:15 Barrett [1] - 114:15 **BARRETT** [1] - 3:8 base [2] - 13:20, 64:15 baseball [1] - 89:25 based [8] - 30:8, 54:17, 54:21, 58:6, 65:7, 133:10, 133:14 basic [1] - 58:9 basis [5] - 47:6, 86:24, 93:20, 103:16, 132:20 **bayous** [1] - 77:9 bearing [1] - 9:15 98:25 beat [1] - 89:25 became [3] - 24:21, 70:7, 70:8 become [2] - 78:1, 127:18 becomes [3] - 16:20, 70:1, 98:7 becoming [1] - 76:10 138:6 bedient [1] - 132:13 Bedient [6] - 44:16, 78:3 69:4, 70:23, 70:24, 72:5. 72:24 Bedient's [2] - 45:6, 47:6 Beetles [1] - 88:25 began [2] - 78:22, 86:1

begin [1] - 6:15

beginning [7] - 5:16,

16:7, 65:25, 68:18,

86:23, 111:1, 132:17

behalf [1] - 12:1 blacked [1] - 22:11 behavior [1] - 117:12 blacked-out [1] belabor [1] - 121:25 22:11 blades [1] - 123:17 believes [4] - 10:17, bleached [1] - 79:3 42:4, 54:12, 85:9 below [1] - 45:11 bleaching [5] - 32:11, belt [1] - 65:2 32:20, 79:5, 79:13, belts [1] - 64:24 79:17 bench [3] - 6:20, 7:10, blessed [1] - 115:5 blessing [3] - 95:24, bend [1] - 94:4 96:1, 109:17 blond [1] - 88:6 **BENEDICT** [3] - 2:21, 52:6. 52:10 blow [1] - 27:19 Benedict [3] - 52:2, blowing [1] - 24:8 52:12. 55:4 blown [2] - 123:4, **benefitted** [1] - 39:15 129:14 Bennett [1] - 12:20 blur [1] - 134:7 berms [2] - 45:15, **Board** [2] - 75:19, 86:21 best [5] - 45:22, 74:7, board [6] - 28:17, 86:15, 96:6, 114:7 28:20, 28:25, 82:25, 103:20, 137:1 better [10] - 19:8, 19:10, 45:16, 54:15, boats [1] - 42:22 56:1, 92:16, 94:4, Bob [3] - 12:11, 24:15, 109:8, 129:9, 137:5 123:11 between [17] - 13:8, Bobby [6] - 74:3, 91:4, 23:22, 39:2, 43:10, 91:21, 97:12, 97:23, 44:21, 46:18, 46:24, 111:15 47:19, 48:10, 48:13, **BOCKIUS** [1] - 3:15 49:1, 49:17, 81:17, **boiled** [2] - 15:12, 99:18, 102:7, 134:5 15:13 beyond [1] - 64:6 bolded [1] - 129:3 bids [1] - 74:23 bonus [3] - 28:19, big [8] - 55:15, 65:8, 29:6, 104:10 79:14, 88:8, 97:2, bonuses [3] - 104:6, 97:15, 131:6 104:14, 104:15 bigger [1] - 100:2 **book** [1] - 30:4 billable [1] - 54:20 **books** [1] - 30:3 Billie [3] - 34:9, 97:5, boomer [1] - 87:25 **boomers** [1] - 87:24 billion [7] - 49:22, **born** [3] - 64:12, 49:23, 59:9, 107:4, 87:25, 96:25 107:5, 113:11, bottom [8] - 17:23, 121:13 18:24, 22:18, 22:22, billions [7] - 62:3, 25:10, 73:22, 96:13, 72:22, 105:21, 100:5 105:23, 110:23, **bottoms** [1] - 95:5 bought [4] - 41:17, bind [3] - 77:23, 78:1, 98:2, 98:4, 98:10 box [2] - 47:21, 47:22 bit [24] - 19:9, 20:12, BOX [1] - 2:19 24:24, 28:13, 33:11, brain [1] - 28:25 48:24, 61:21, 76:9, brand [2] - 99:20, 78:17, 79:19, 80:2, 99:21 87:18, 88:3, 96:3, brand-new [2] - 99:20, 97:23, 98:17, 100:8, 99:21 106:2, 112:2, Brazos [1] - 97:17 116:25, 118:24, breach [2] - 45:9, 131:2, 132:22, 45:15 133:11 break [6] - 52:4, 55:6,

55:8, 84:19, 84:21, 138:23 breaking [1] - 138:16 BRIAN [1] - 3:11 bridge [9] - 11:9, 16:18, 16:19, 18:22, 23:2, 27:13, 38:16, 95:21, 128:1 Bridge [1] - 73:20 **brief** [8] - 10:18, 10:20, 27:14, 39:1, 52:23, 52:24, 54:25, 78:24 briefly [9] - 13:22, 16:5, 45:7, 61:20, 66:4, 68:10, 129:14, 135:14 bring [9] - 6:6, 44:5, 44:7, 44:8, 54:8, 83:20, 88:13, 111:12, 138:14 bringing [6] - 40:8, 49:7, 81:1, 83:19, 99:21, 126:5 brother [2] - 21:13, 88:7 **brothers** [3] - 97:10, 97:14, 97:20 brought [5] - 44:20, 103:9, 111:25, 115:18, 128:23 **Brown** [1] - 91:8 **BRUNS** [1] - 3:5 Bryan [3] - 24:8, 24:9, 27:19 build [4] - 71:24, 72:16, 92:12, 96:2 building [4] - 87:16, 89:6, 94:12 **buildings** [3] - 80:5, 89:12, 89:14 built [7] - 24:25, 27:23, 62:23, 91:15, 95:15, 108:3, 111:16 bump [2] - 96:16 burden [2] - 5:18, 6:13 Burma [9] - 22:25, 62:11, 91:7, 91:8, 91:12, 91:21, 96:2, 97:12, 111:16 burning [1] - 79:15 burns [7] - 62:13, 62:15, 74:2, 74:12, 91:11, 96:17, 97:12 **Burns** [6] - 74:3, 74:6, 91:4, 91:21, 97:23, 111:15 business [15] - 7:14, 12:10, 61:16, 86:18, 90:11, 94:13, 97:8,

97:11, 97:21, 98:13, 104:20, 122:16, 122:17, 133:18 businesses [1] -94:11 businessman [1] -97:19 **busy** [1] - 90:4 **butter** [4] - 19:16, 19:17, 19:21 button [1] - 7:8 buy [8] - 38:6, 38:7, 61:6, 61:8, 61:9, 61:12, 61:15 buyer [3] - 33:22, 34:22, 36:5 **buying** [1] - 38:10 buys [1] - 42:1 BY [12] - 2:7, 2:14, 2:21, 3:8, 3:17, 3:23, 4:8, 10:13, 52:6, 55:20, 85:2, 114:12 **by-product** [1] - 77:3 **bylaws** [1] - 98:19

# C

cagle [1] - 12:4 Cagle [1] - 12:8 calculate [1] - 44:24 calendar [3] - 16:9, 103:15, 104:13 canal [1] - 97:17 cannot [2] - 113:16, 120:17 cap [3] - 106:12, 106:13, 106:23 capacity [1] - 71:3 capital [2] - 119:20, 119:25 **CAPITOL** [1] - 2:19 capped [2] - 50:6, Captain [8] - 122:13, 122:14, 122:22, 123:13, 123:24, 125:3, 128:20, 128:24 car [9] - 60:4, 60:5, 60:6. 60:8. 61:9. 65:7. 67:12. 112:25. 113:4 cardboard [11] -45:23, 46:1, 46:6, 46:19, 46:24, 47:19, 47:22, 100:20, 101:3 care [2] - 7:14, 39:16 careful [2] - 18:7, 19:7 carefully [3] - 43:20, 114:3, 132:12

Caroline [2] - 1:19, 140:24 carried [1] - 83:17 cars [3] - 59:25, 64:23, 76.23 **CARTER** [4] - 3:17, 55:18, 55:20, 55:23 Carter [7] - 55:17, 64:10, 84:17, 120:25, 125:21, 130:2, 130:13 Carter's [1] - 88:13 carton [4] - 45:25, 46:6, 100:20 cartons [3] - 45:24, 46:1, 101:3 carves [1] - 123:18 case [96] - 5:17, 8:18, 9:2, 9:3, 10:6, 10:17, 11:3, 12:24, 13:23, 14:10, 15:22, 16:6, 16:7, 16:11, 19:13, 20:3, 20:9, 26:3, 27:5, 27:16, 28:11, 32:13, 35:17, 35:24, 37:7, 37:23, 38:22, 40:7, 40:9, 41:25, 43:14, 47:4, 47:17, 50:3, 50:5, 50:12, 51:21, 51:23, 53:17, 54:1, 54:18, 55:24, 56:3, 56:11, 56:13, 56:19, 57:2, 58:8, 58:10, 58:23, 60:14, 62:16, 65:10, 67:16, 68:2, 70:25, 73:7, 75:25, 80:12, 81:25, 84:16, 85:9, 85:11, 85:13, 87:20, 90:18, 92:17, 95:12, 106:3, 106:14, 107:3, 108:8, 110:9, 111:5, 111:6, 111:8, 111:10, 111:12, 114:23, 115:14, 115:15, 115:17, 115:22, 116:20, 117:2, 117:3, 119:18, 120:7, 120:19, 126:5, 126:6, 132:2, 134:23, 137:20, cases [3] - 6:18, 7:22, 8:9 cash [1] - 98:21 cat [1] - 88:9 cat-eye [1] - 88:9 catalytic [1] - 112:24

catch [1] - 136:13

catch-all [1] - 136:13 causation [1] - 125:23 **CAUSE** [1] - 1:2 caused [6] - 15:20, 40:10, 41:6, 43:18, 79:15, 132:1 causes [1] - 125:18 causing [5] - 40:14, 80:21, 90:11, 125:20, 130:17 **CDDs** [1] - 79:6 CDFs [1] - 79:6 ceased [3] - 72:13, 85:23. 103:2 celebrate [1] - 115:5 cells [3] - 80:15, 80:22, 130:5 center [3] - 88:6, 100:25, 112:16 cereal [1] - 110:15 certain [7] - 29:12, 34:15, 53:3, 64:6, 68:8, 127:2, 136:7 certainly [7] - 31:9, 76:20, 76:22, 83:1, 84:8, 86:24, 89:20 certify [2] - 140:5, 140:13 cetera [1] - 125:12 **chain** [3] - 13:8, 59:17, 59:24 **chairman** [1] - 29:16 chambers [1] - 140:11 Champion [79] -12:25, 13:1, 13:23, 14:13, 14:18, 14:19, 16:25, 17:3, 17:4, 20:15, 20:22, 21:12, 21:20, 22:1, 22:2, 23:3, 23:17, 23:19, 23:24, 24:5, 26:4, 26:9, 26:14, 27:4, 27:5, 27:8, 32:2, 32:24, 33:6, 37:21, 38:3, 39:3, 40:20, 40:21, 40:22, 40:23, 41:2, 41:3, 41:9, 43:4, 44:23, 49:21, 57:24, 61:3, 61:4, 62:5, 62:25, 63:9, 71:5, 71:7, 71:10, 71:13, 72:6, 73:1, 82:23, 83:6, 83:22, 90:13, 91:7, 91:22, 93:6, 93:16, 93:23, 96:20, 98:1, 98:14, 99:9, 99:11, 99:13, 99:23, 100:10, 100:11, 100:14, 100:19, 101:21,

101:25, 102:7 Champion's [8] -20:24, 21:2, 21:3, 24:13, 25:21, 74:2 chance [3] - 25:8, 85:6, 114:2 change [5] - 44:6, 44:9, 64:17, 80:25, 112:3 changed [10] - 64:13, 64:14, 64:15, 64:16, 64:25, 65:6, 79:16, 117:12 changing [1] - 112:2 **channel** [1] - 80:3 characterize [1] -102:16 charge [5] - 12:7, 66:10, 67:21, 68:4, 92:3 Charge [2] - 5:25, 6:4 charts [1] - 88:25 **CHASE** [1] - 2:5 cheap [5] - 45:23, 46:18, 46:24, 47:18, 47:19 cheaper [3] - 45:23, 45:25, 46:5 checked [6] - 89:17, 95:9, 95:10, 95:11, 118:9 chemical [3] - 75:6, 79:18. 114:1 chemistry [1] - 75:7 Cher [1] - 88:23 Chesser [2] - 23:10, 23:12 chief [11] - 12:7, 12:16, 37:16, 37:17, 57:6, 57:13, 62:18, 64:7, 80:12, 92:4, 130:7 children [4] - 97:5, 97:6, 97:21, 105:7 Chin [1] - 114:25 chlorine [1] - 79:17 chocolate [1] - 19:21 **choose** [1] - 5:20 CHRIS [1] - 3:18 Chuck [1] - 133:6 chunk [1] - 129:20 circled [1] - 129:15 circumstances [2] -54:5, 126:7 City [1] - 97:18 city [3] - 11:23, 112:15, 112:18 civil [14] - 5:17, 40:9, 48:9, 49:1, 49:16,

50:7, 50:10, 51:20,

53:7, 105:22, 106:15, 111:6, 114:5 claim [5] - 43:17, 56:6, 72:18, 84:9, 121:13 claimed 131 - 9:16. 65:22, 65:25 claiming [2] - 58:19, 59:4 claims [1] - 60:1 clay [9] - 17:23, 18:25, 24:24, 73:23, 95:6, 95:22, 96:7, 96:9 clean [1] - 113:15 cleaned [1] - 77:18 cleaning [3] - 9:13, 110:19, 120:8 cleanup [9] - 9:20, 60:16, 60:18, 72:20, 110:12, 111:5, 111:6, 113:18, 120:14 clear [5] - 40:6, 95:17, 116:15, 120:22, 125:15 client [3] - 116:20, 121:10, 138:4 clients [2] - 8:13, 137:19 close [3] - 28:14, 51:13, 123:2 close-up [2] - 28:14, 51:13 closed [7] - 87:13. 102:9, 102:14, 103:4, 105:17, 110:7, 110:10 closely [2] - 136:16, 137:8 closer [1] - 81:1 **closing** [2] - 6:10, 102:21 closure [2] - 104:16, 108:22 Coast [2] - 31:22, 107:22 coat [1] - 88:8 Code [5] - 15:11, 43:25, 48:1, 48:7, 50:1 codes [1] - 20:25 COLIN [1] - 3:10 colleagues [2] -81:14, 115:11 collect [2] - 120:24, 121:2 collection [1] - 133:12 collective [1] - 55:25 collision [2] - 59:17, 59:25 column [1] - 128:4

CORPORATION [1] -

**combustion** [1] - 77:3 comfortable [4] - 7:4, 7:14, 8:16, 8:19 coming [7] - 61:15, 65:2, 65:3, 78:23, 89:12, 116:21, 120:18 commenced [1] -102:5 comment [3] - 124:10, 126:24, 127:9 comments [2] - 124:6, 124:11 commercial [1] -42:22 commission [3] -52:12, 52:15, 53:2 COMMISSION [1] commissioner [2] -12:4, 12:8 commissioners [1] -12:9 commitment [4] -8:16, 8:20, 92:13, 114:9 communicate [1] -23:13 community [4] -13:14, 133:18, 133:20 community-bycommunity [1] -133:18 companies [15] -11:17, 13:2, 13:11, 13:12, 13:18, 32:15, 33:14, 37:21, 60:2, 62:7, 62:13, 64:3, 80:7, 119:24, 134:6 **COMPANY** [2] - 1:9, 3:14 company [62] - 13:5, 17:1, 18:12, 23:3, 28:22, 28:23, 29:1, 29:2, 30:11, 31:4, 31:7, 31:8, 33:14, 33:18, 34:7, 34:8, 34:13, 34:16, 34:21, 35:2, 35:8, 35:13, 36:4, 38:1, 38:7, 38:8, 38:11, 38:12, 39:3, 41:11, 41:18, 59:8, 60:9, 61:11, 61:12, 61:14, 61:15, 62:1, 62:12, 72:6, 85:24, 86:7, 90:23, 91:5, 91:7, 91:9, 91:10, 91:11, 91:12, 97:22, 98:19, 104:5,

105:10, 116:23, 119:21, 120:16, 133:10, 134:11, 136:6 compare [1] - 129:15 compartments [1] -121:6 complain [2] - 61:22, 67:12 complaining [1] - 56:4 **complaint** [1] - 83:2 complete [4] - 20:19, 21:4, 41:12, 41:23 completely [4] -29:19, 106:2, 122:7, Complies [1] - 85:18 composed [4] - 17:23, 18:24, 73:22, 95:6 computer [1] - 1:21 computer-assisted [1] - 1:21 computerized [1] -1:21 con [1] - 124:11 concentrations [1] -131:8 concept [1] - 125:23 concern [3] - 41:19, 61:4, 127:25 concerned [1] - 128:5 concerning [3] -58:23, 68:24, 82:1 concert [1] - 90:9 conclude [2] - 51:25, 116:10 conclusion [1] - 138:9 concrete [5] - 46:17, 46:18, 46:19, 46:24, 47:20 condition [3] - 21:22, 23:4, 29:23 condor [1] - 39:4 conduct [12] - 30:18, 42:5, 48:14, 117:8, 126:3, 126:4, 126:8, 127:10, 128:13, 137:22, 137:23, 137:24 conference [2] - 5:25, 29:17 conferences [1] - 7:10 confirm [2] - 81:18, 81:19 confirmed [3] - 79:4, 79:13, 119:14 confirming [1] - 32:20 confused [2] - 79:7,

79:8

**CONGRESS** [1] - 2:12

conjunction [2] -21:12, 21:14, 50:5, 32:10, 32:18 50:6, 56:8, 63:1, connect [1] - 132:24 69:6, 69:7, 69:8, connected [1] - 118:6 69:10, 72:6, 91:6, CONNECTICUT [1] -93:7, 93:8, 93:15, 3:21 93:20, 93:21, 97:25, 98:14, 99:9, 99:12, connection [8] -102:6 25:13, 25:16, 26:22, contracted [2] - 66:12, 28:11, 30:14, 64:2, 84:10 133:2 contractor [18] -**CONNELLY** [1] - 2:4 20:23, 62:15, 62:17, consent [1] - 99:11 62:23, 63:3, 63:5, consider [11] - 10:6, 63:7, 64:6, 65:16, 26:10, 26:16, 26:25, 66:16, 67:25, 72:11, 39:7, 39:9, 40:20, 72:17, 73:3, 74:19, 41:10, 41:20, 131:21 83:14, 90:19, 93:17 considered [3] contractors [1] -39:11, 77:21, 93:17 74:23 considering [1] contrary [1] - 83:11 90:22 contributions [2] consistently [1] -119:21, 119:25 64:17 control [11] - 23:20, constantly [1] - 95:3 31:10, 36:23, 41:12, construct [2] - 69:1, 41:23, 42:3, 72:16, 71:13 75:24, 84:6, 84:8, constructed [1] -135:3 63:21 Control [10] - 12:12, constructing [1] -17:12, 17:16, 75:10, 115:25 75:19, 75:20, 75:23, construction [10] -75:24, 86:21, 92:7 91:10. 91:16. 95:11. **controller** [1] - 99:3 97:8, 97:10, 97:14, convened [1] - 28:17 97:17. 108:5. 108:11, 128:2 conversation [2] -24:15, 73:25 contact [3] - 23:11, converter [1] - 112:25 82:23, 118:4 coordinates [1] **contacted** [1] - 92:3 128:14 **contacting** [1] - 118:4 coordination [1] contain [3] - 22:21, 21:1 23:15, 27:24 copies [1] - 137:5 containing [10] copy [6] - 6:5, 19:8, 14:22, 15:8, 25:2, 24:11, 45:17, 125:4, 36:2, 40:24, 44:13, 140.6 44:17, 47:17, 50:24, COPY [1] - 1:14 51:16 corner [3] - 129:16, contains [1] - 140:6 129:21, 131:4 contaminated [1] -Corp [4] - 124:3, 128:3 128:14, 129:3, contamination [2] -129:10 45:12, 127:25 CORP [1] - 4:4 contends [1] - 110:8 corp [1] - 129:4 context [1] - 25:9 corporate [10] - 13:8, **continue** [3] - 43:6, 13:21, 30:14, 44:21, 103:4, 112:12 44:25, 85:19, 86:2, continued [5] - 40:22, 86:11, 115:1, 133:7 45:13, 96:2, 104:17, corporation [9] -104:20 24:17, 29:13, 29:15, contract [30] - 20:16, 30:12, 31:9, 91:1, 20:17, 20:19, 20:22, 105:5, 137:8 20:25, 21:3, 21:5,

1:10 Corporation [6] -13:7, 13:9, 34:11, 36:14, 85:14, 99:10 corporation's [4] -29:17, 30:2, 30:3, 30:6 correct [12] - 71:15, 71:16, 71:17, 71:19, 71:20, 71:23, 76:1, 76:24, 77:6, 77:7, 77:15, 140:6 correctly [1] - 140:14 correspondence [1] -118:2 Corvette [1] - 66:19 cost [1] - 30:4 COUNSEL [5] - 2:3, 2:17, 3:4, 3:14, 4:3 counsel [6] - 37:24, 42:9, 106:18, 133:4, 135:23, 140:8 counsel's [2] - 135:12, 135:25 **COUNTY** [6] - 1:4, 1:8, 2:3, 2:11, 2:14, 140:1 county [18] - 11:24, 12:5, 12:6, 12:7, 12:18, 13:19, 41:24, 60:2, 62:19, 69:3, 71:2, 71:3, 73:8, 74:15, 74:16, 76:5, 124:21, 137:22 County [114] - 1:20, 9:21, 9:23, 10:16, 11:22, 11:23, 11:25, 12:1, 12:2, 12:4, 12:13, 12:16, 12:19, 13:25, 14:12, 17:3, 17:5, 17:12, 17:15, 27:6, 39:10, 40:7, 42:4, 42:11, 42:12, 42:13, 42:15, 42:24, 48:15, 48:18, 50:2, 50:5, 53:9, 53:23, 56:13, 57:14, 58:19, 59:2, 59:11, 61:18, 61:22, 61:25, 62:4, 62:20, 63:5, 63:14, 63:23, 66:25, 69:3, 69:15, 71:1, 71:9, 72:1, 72:21, 73:12, 73:16, 75:11, 76:23, 77:9, 77:12, 78:5, 80:13, 80:18, 82:13, 83:5, 83:14, 84:11, 84:12, 85:25, 92:7, 102:19, 105:23,

117:12, 130:11

106:17, 106:18, 106:21, 106:22, 107:6, 107:16, 109:1, 109:8, 110:22, 115:22, 116:6, 122:6, 124:17, 124:18, 124:23, 125:4, 125:5, 125:9, 126:3, 126:7, 126:13, 126:15, 126:18, 126:20, 127:1, 127:2, 129:25, 130:8, 131:14, 131:25, 132:20, 132:23, 134:3, 134:7, 135:10, 135:11, 137:25, 138:1, 140:4, 140:23 County's [25] - 12:14, 23:25, 51:14, 56:2, 62:17, 62:22, 62:24, 64:1, 64:7, 68:20, 70:18, 70:20, 71:4, 73:8, 73:11, 92:4, 102:25, 103:10, 105:25, 109:12, 109:17, 121:25, 122:10, 131:20, 134:16 couple [5] - 58:16, 63:12, 73:5, 103:9, 134:22 course [6] - 12:23, 39:7, 55:25, 80:25, 115:2, 136:14 court [8] - 6:17, 22:13, 53:6, 67:13, 67:14, 113:16, 125:23, 140:11 Court [5] - 5:11, 140:3, 140:4, 140:22, 140:23 COURT [14] - 1:2, 1:4, 5:4, 5:12, 8:22, 22:9, 52:1, 55:4, 55:10, 84:17, 84:23, 114:10, 123:1, 138:21 court's [1] - 82:18 Court's [1] - 6:4 courtroom [4] - 6:6, 7:6, 52:22, 80:19 cover [3] - 61:7, 122:8, 129:9 covered [1] - 122:5 CRAIG [1] - 3:18 create [2] - 58:13, 58:15 created [2] - 77:22,

79:13 credibility [2] - 7:23, 130:20 credible [1] - 130:21 crisis [1] - 136:22 critical [1] - 91:13 critically [4] - 122:4, 122:6, 122:23, 123:25 cross [1] - 131:23 cross-examination [1] - 131:23 **CRUTCHER** [1] - 3:21 CSR [1] - 140:21 cubic [4] - 28:1, 32:17, 123:21, 124:2 cup [4] - 19:20, 19:24, 19:25 Cup [1] - 19:24 cups [1] - 13:13 current [3] - 28:22, 46:1, 118:21 cut [2] - 100:12, 100:18 cute [1] - 88:6 cuter [1] - 88:12

112:17, 132:11,

21:17, 22:7, 23:8,

23:16, 24:6, 24:12,

30:17, 36:19, 65:23,

decide [3] - 8:14, 8:17,

30:11, 33:13, 33:18,

December [11] -

90:8. 128:21

decided [6] - 29:2,

61:12, 129:11

decision [5] - 28:22,

decisions [4] - 6:2,

declared [1] - 38:16

7:22, 28:24

deed [4] - 31:4,

119:12

3:14, 4:3

118:21, 119:4,

deep [1] - 116:12

defend [1] - 67:13

defendants [17] -

5:20, 5:22, 6:12,

9:11, 12:23, 12:24,

14:24, 15:1, 15:4,

**DEFENDANT** [3] - 3:4,

48:11, 48:12, 48:16

54:7

137:16

## D

15:6, 23:22, 42:10, **D.C** [1] - 3:22 51:19, 53:16, 59:22, 109:12, 113:18 dad [2] - 64:25, 65:1 Defendants [1] - 1:11 daily [8] - 15:7, 32:22, defendants' [9] -36:1, 45:13, 105:24, 44:25, 46:3, 46:21, 132:5, 132:19, 140:6 **DAILY** [1] - 1:14 47:16, 50:20, 51:2, 51:9, 126:4, 126:8 damage [2] - 40:9, definitions [1] - 6:8 60:1 degree [1] - 75:8 damages [1] - 107:4 degrees [1] - 75:6 dangerous [1] - 93:18 delay [1] - 83:19 **DANIEL** [1] - 3:23 **deliberate** [1] - 6:16 dark [1] - 102:17 deliberating [1] - 6:15 data [1] - 81:11 delivering [1] - 40:23 Date [1] - 140:22 demonstration [1] date [5] - 28:15, 29:4, 96:12 34:2, 99:8 denied [1] - 116:6 dated [2] - 14:7, 24:12 **DENNIS** [1] - 114:15 daughter [1] - 98:25 denying [1] - 130:1 **DAVID** [2] - 2:8, 3:19 Department [1] -Davis [2] - 102:25, 25:20 103:5 department [7] - 67:1, days [6] - 40:20, 41:9, 42:7, 48:17, 49:19, 126:19, 127:16, 52:10 127:21, 128:11, 128:17, 130:10 deal [6] - 6:22, 37:24, departments [1] -82:19, 133:19, 92:11 134:16 deposed [1] - 85:25 dealing [3] - 39:23, deposition [1] -58:18, 60:25 126:18 **DEBRA** [1] - 2:8 deputy [1] - 60:3 decades [5] - 47:21,

**Deputy** [1] - 60:4 describe [2] - 27:15, 44:20 described [9] - 8:23, 16:22, 45:24, 59:20, 61:13, 62:20, 69:23, 69:25, 100:3 description [2] -45:22, 106:1 design [10] - 61:19, 62:22, 62:24, 71:7, 71:10, 71:21, 74:20, 91:16, 92:12, 95:11 designated [5] - 10:5, 21:2, 39:18, 49:15, 76:5 designating [1] - 86:2 designed [1] - 72:4 designing [1] - 87:16 despite [5] - 50:22, 50:23, 51:8, 51:11, 91:20 destroyed [2] - 73:9, 109:13 detail [5] - 44:21, 48:5, 50:9, 54:15, 102:2 detailed [1] - 39:5 detect [1] - 78:13 deteriorating [1] -95:3 determination [3] -10:1, 38:18, 114:5 determine [2] - 32:16, 131:18 determined [3] -14:17, 39:25, 41:1 determining [2] -10:6, 39:12 detract [1] - 16:13 developed [1] - 78:13 developing [2] - 74:3, 92:20 development [2] -50:18, 51:7 diapers [1] - 13:13 died [3] - 57:23, 75:4 difference [1] - 108:20 different [35] - 11:17, 11:22, 11:23, 11:24, 12:5, 15:1, 15:25, 16:1, 27:21, 28:6, 28:8, 31:23, 36:7, 36:10, 37:10, 37:15, 37:20, 40:13, 47:25, 48:3, 48:4, 48:24, 49:6, 49:8, 56:25, 66:21, 76:17, 81:7,

87:23, 121:1, 121:6,

differently [3] - 36:11,

130:18

difficult [1] - 86:3 dikes [8] - 17:23, 18:24, 22:20, 23:14, 25:25, 73:22, 95:6, 95:23 diligence [8] - 37:25, 38:2, 61:5, 61:9, 61:10, 61:11, 74:25, 75:2 dioxin [74] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:4, 14:17, 14:21, 14:22, 14:25, 15:5, 15:9, 25:2, 32:7, 33:1, 36:2, 36:24, 38:15, 38:16, 38:18, 38:21, 39:19, 39:20, 39:25, 40:24, 41:1, 41:2, 41:7, 42:2, 42:7, 44:12, 44:13, 44:18, 47:18, 49:15, 50:24, 51:5, 51:16, 76:6, 76:9, 76:11, 76:12, 76:16, 76:25, 77:1, 77:13, 77:22, 78:3, 78:6, 78:7, 78:8, 78:9, 78:11, 78:14, 78:19, 78:23, 78:25, 79:7, 79:14, 79:15, 79:20, 79:21, 81:17, 81:20, 81:23, 109:5, 109:23, 110:15, 113:19, 130:15, 131:8, 131:9, 132:5, 132:14, 135:17, 136:9, 137:9 dioxins [3] - 32:12, 32:21, 128:4 dire [6] - 5:16, 13:10, 52:11, 53:1, 61:13, 114:16 direct [1] - 74:10 directly [4] - 10:16, 12:21, 122:11, 133:20 director [5] - 12:12, 17:16, 75:9, 92:6, 94:15 directors [6] - 17:13, 28:17, 28:20, 28:25, 37:11, 37:12 disapproval [1] -74:11 discharge [8] - 48:22, 49:14, 49:17, 70:15. 74:21, 82:10, 84:9 discharged [3] -48:11, 49:2, 72:18 **disclose** [1] - 34:6

disclosed [5] - 33:19, 33:23, 34:12, 34:23, disclosing [2] - 33:21, 34:5 disclosure [1] - 34:1 discovered [1] -127:21 discuss [2] - 42:10, 44:17 discussed [4] - 29:18, 78:6, 127:15, 138:23 discussion [4] -24:16, 29:11, 43:9, 43:10 discussions [1] -102:3 dismissed [1] - 67:16 disposal [45] - 21:1, 22:6, 24:12, 25:13, 25:17, 25:21, 26:22, 34:15, 48:21, 56:8, 56:12, 56:15, 57:5, 61:19, 61:23, 62:7, 62:16, 62:19, 63:4, 64:2, 64:5, 68:5, 68:13, 68:17, 74:9, 74:11, 76:8, 76:14, 80:17, 82:15, 82:16, 82:17, 82:24, 85:24, 87:12, 91:6, 91:13, 93:14, 97:25, 98:13, 99:12, 102:5, 104:20, 107:19, 136:7 Disposal [8] - 48:2, 48:19, 65:12, 65:24, 66:5, 68:11, 68:12, 69:11 dispose [4] - 62:8, 67:25, 72:17, 90:19 disposed [4] - 33:24, 62:6, 66:16, 70:7 disposing [1] - 116:1 dispute [5] - 9:3, 23:21, 66:11, 68:2, 69:7 disruptive [1] - 123:20 distance [1] - 108:3 distributed [1] - 98:23 District [2] - 140:4, 140:23 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:4, 1:11 district [1] - 12:6 **DIVISION** [1] - 2:18 division [2] - 52:17, 81:13 document [23] - 6:4, 6:5, 6:7, 24:22, 25:6,

25:8, 25:23, 26:8, 26:13, 26:15, 27:11, 28:19, 29:4, 75:1, 83:5, 83:7, 128:7, 135:25, 136:2, 136:16, 136:23, 136:25, 137:3 documents [44] -11:4, 14:1, 14:2, 14:4, 16:11, 22:11, 26:2, 26:5, 28:21, 45:22, 53:18, 57:21, 58:4, 58:5, 58:6, 58:8, 62:21, 69:24, 69:25, 70:3, 75:1, 81:18, 81:19, 81:22, 83:12, 83:16, 84:2, 86:13, 91:3, 99:14, 100:11, 101:6, 103:19, 103:20, 109:10, 109:12, 109:18, 121:22, 135:12, 135:13, 135:19, 135:21, 137:19, 138:8 dogs [1] - 88:10 dollar [3] - 50:21, 51:3, 121:13 dollars [18] - 16:2, 33:25, 34:21, 36:6, 37:9, 40:19, 41:9, 42:7, 42:8, 49:5, 62:3, 72:22, 105:22, 105:23, 121:11, 137:20, 138:5, 138:6 done [28] - 17:6, 18:3, 18:6, 19:4, 19:6, 21:23, 23:5, 47:7, 60:9, 75:6, 76:15, 93:8, 97:15, 102:12, 108:24, 110:17, 110:18, 111:4, 113:9, 117:12, 119:20, 120:4, 121:12, 127:5, 134:24, 138:13 door [3] - 84:12, 93:2, 122:11 **Doris** [3] - 34:9, 97:5, 98:25 down [21] - 15:12, 15:13, 19:9, 23:9, 24:9, 30:4, 36:8, 51:24, 59:15, 77:6,

93:2, 96:13, 100:5,

100:16, 100:22,

101:15, 111:21,

**Dr** [50] - 17:5, 17:11,

112:7, 115:10,

123:17

44:15, 45:3, 45:6, 47:6, 57:23, 64:7, 69:4, 70:23, 70:24, 72:5, 72:24, 73:10, 74:1, 74:5, 74:18, 75:3, 76:2, 83:24, 92:3, 92:14, 92:18, 92:21, 93:4, 94:15, 94:17, 94:23, 94:24, 95:4, 95:5, 96:1, 96:8, 96:10, 102:20, 109:11, 111:17, 122:2, 123:12, 125:10, 131:1 drag [1] - 108:10 drain [1] - 93:2 drains [1] - 101:24 dramatization [1] -123:14 drawn [1] - 96:5 dredge [4] - 42:21, 43:5, 122:18, 127:8 dredged [6] - 80:17, 80:22, 122:24. 123:5, 123:22, 130:5 dredger [1] - 125:19 dredges [1] - 125:18 dredging [42] - 42:20, 42:23, 42:24, 42:25, 43:2, 46:11, 50:25, 80:3, 80:6, 80:20, 81:8, 81:24, 108:7, 108:8, 108:15, 108:19, 108:24, 122:16, 122:21, 123:8, 123:12, 123:13, 124:10, 125:3, 125:14, 125:25, 126:12, 126:21, 127:2, 127:18, 128:2, 128:5, 128:25, 129:5, 129:12, 129:20, 129:23, 131:3, 131:16, 131:21, 131:25, 138:2 dried [2] - 100:24, 101:3 drive [4] - 11:10, 76:23, 88:23, 112:13 drives [1] - 66:19 driving [3] - 67:6, 67:8, 112:7 dropped [1] - 81:5 drove [3] - 112:19, 113:6, 115:10 dry [1] - 96:14

21:19, 23:18, 24:17,

30:16, 42:17, 44:10,

due [17] - 10:4, 29:23, 35:7, 35:12, 37:25, 38:2, 38:20, 41:15, 61:5, 61:9, 61:10, 61:11, 74:25, 75:2, 81:23, 116:9, 136:13 dug [1] - 138:8 duly [1] - 30:9 dump [6] - 29:14, 29:20, 30:13, 30:15, 102:10, 137:7 dumped [1] - 102:16 dumping [4] - 26:11, 26:17, 26:25, 93:2 **DUNN** [1] - 3:21 during [18] - 29:14, 29:16, 36:2, 36:25, 41:3, 43:1, 49:3, 49:6, 49:8, 56:4, 68:19, 86:17, 86:18, 114:16, 121:18, 121:22, 126:10, 130:19 duty [1] - 116:17 dwell [1] - 53:25

# Ε

early [5] - 16:1, 16:11, 16:14, 79:3, 79:12 **EARNEST** [1] - 2:7 easiest [1] - 22:9 easily [2] - 18:6, 19:6 east [1] - 11:10 East [1] - 97:2 eastern [1] - 101:12 edge [1] - 129:17 effect [11] - 57:3, 65:12, 65:13, 67:23, 67:24, 68:12, 69:12, 82:10, 105:18, 113:15, 120:11 efficient [1] - 51:23 effluent [2] - 32:13 effort [3] - 91:25, 120:9, 120:14 egg [5] - 45:24, 45:25, 46:6, 100:20, 101:3 Eighth [2] - 89:19, 89:22 either [2] - 23:25, 105:12 elaborate [1] - 121:16 elected [1] - 12:3 **elevation** [1] - 81:6 **eliminate** [1] - 30:2 **eloquently** [1] - 133:5 employed [1] - 104:12 **employee** [1] - 82:22 employees [8] - 20:23,

115:15 encourage [1] -136:16 encouraged [1] -129:4 encouraging [1] -129:3 end [22] - 21:19, 25:5, 35:18, 38:21, 58:23, 81:25, 98:1, 103:18, 104:6, 104:8, 104:10, 104:12, 104:13, 104:18, 104:19, 109:19, 117:21, 122:6, 125:24, 127:7, 136:12, 138:1 ended [6] - 56:8, 69:8, 69:10, 91:17, 96:18, 102:5 ends [1] - 69:7 engaged [2] - 86:9, 97:11 engineer [4] - 75:8. 96:5. 123:11. 129:10 Engineering [5] -62:11, 91:8, 91:22, 96:2, 111:16 engineering [5] -22:25, 44:11, 91:8, 91:9, 97:12 Engineers [2] - 124:3, 128:14 engulfed [1] - 40:25 enter [4] - 17:25, 19:1, 73:24, 95:7 entered [2] - 20:16, 93:7 entire [9] - 6:7, 22:4, 25:11, 26:21, 31:19, 36:25, 46:8, 75:2, 137:19 entitled [1] - 1:18 entity [2] - 12:25, 28:23

entrepreneur [1] -

environment [3] -

envelopes [2] - 128:9

10:3, 14:23, 38:19

Environmental [6] -

9:6, 34:2, 36:15,

- 1:6, 2:18

36:18, 36:20, 36:21

**ENVIRONMENTAL** [2]

environmental [37] -

9:9, 12:16, 35:4,

35:8, 35:9, 35:13,

96:24

37:7, 37:9, 86:4,

99:2, 99:5, 115:2,

35:14, 36:16, 40:2, 41:15, 41:16, 41:22, 43:4, 44:11, 44:22, 48:3, 51:18, 52:13, 52:15, 52:16, 53:2, 53:8, 53:12, 57:6, 57:13, 59:21, 62:18, 64:7, 80:12, 87:2, 91:18, 92:4, 92:9, 105:17, 111:19, 130:7, 136:14 **EPA** [26] - 9:8, 9:12, 9:25, 10:3, 10:5, 14:17, 32:7, 32:9, 32:10, 32:18, 33:1, 38:17, 38:19, 39:18, 39:25, 41:1, 49:15, 60:24, 61:25, 109:22, 110:11, 111:5, 119:15, 119:18, 119:23, 120:2 EPA's [2] - 9:17, 60:22 **equipment** [9] - 21:5, 74:6, 74:7, 74:8, 101:9, 122:3, 123:16, 123:20, 125:11 equivalent [1] - 95:25 er [1] - 41:7 escape [10] - 17:8, 17:25, 18:5, 19:1, 19:5, 21:24, 23:6, 43:17, 73:24, 95:7 especially [2] - 52:23, 59:8 established [1] -97:19 estate [3] - 29:12, 30:12, 137:6 et [1] - 125:11 evaluate [3] - 126:3, 137:23 evaluating [3] - 126:8, 128:13, 134:24 evening [1] - 139:1 Evening [1] - 139:3 events [5] - 45:2, 86:8, 121:23, 132:24, 132:25 evidence [86] - 5:22, 5:23, 7:25, 8:5, 8:15, 8:17, 9:4, 10:17, 10:19, 10:20, 10:22, 10:23, 10:24, 10:25, 11:6, 13:3, 21:10, 24:7, 25:7, 27:2, 27:4, 27:8, 28:7, 29:4, 30:21, 31:14, 33:5, 33:17, 34:5,

35:16, 37:6, 37:11, 37:23, 39:8, 39:9, 39:11, 39:23, 42:9, 42:15, 42:19, 42:23, 43:3, 44:25, 46:4, 46:12, 46:22, 47:4, 50:16, 53:15, 53:18, 54:14, 56:22, 56:24, 57:17, 62:9, 69:9, 70:22, 72:23, 84:3, 85:9, 94:16, 98:18, 101:6, 101:10, 102:6, 103:19, 106:7, 107:1, 107:14, 110:24, 113:23, 115:20, 116:11, 117:15, 122:14, 126:12, 129:7, 131:7, 134:2, 134:15, 135:11, 138:18, 140:7, 140:16

exact [2] - 15:12, 26:8 examination [1] -131:23 example [4] - 59:14, 64:23, 66:19, 112:3 except [3] - 18:15, 25:7, 94:20 excerpted [2] - 20:19, 22:3

excerpting [1] - 36:3 excerpts [1] - 29:5 excess [2] - 67:6, 67:8 exciting [1] - 90:4 excuse [2] - 66:5, 131:6 executive [1] - 37:17

executive [1] - 37:17 Exhibit [1] - 123:3 exhibit [4] - 19:13, 122:19, 127:11, 130:4 exhibits [2] - 130:2,

140:15

exist [2] - 98:10, 98:11 existed [1] - 69:19 existence [5] - 63:21, 91:19, 91:21, 92:10, 117:17

existing [3] - 57:2, 63:17, 63:22 exists [1] - 97:2 expanding [1] - 28:3 expansive [4] - 35:8, 35:12, 41:16, 136:14 expect [4] - 53:16, 84:11, 131:23, 132:14

**experienced** [1] - 54:10

experiences [1] -114:18 expert [6] - 54:16, 63:2, 63:9, 102:25, 103:5, 129:22 experts [13] - 46:4, 46:13, 70:25, 103:6, 113:25, 123:10, 129:8, 129:19, 131:12, 131:13, 131:24, 132:3, 132:12 Expiration [1] -140:22 explain [10] - 19:11, 48:4, 49:7, 50:10, 54:12, 55:11, 91:2, 96:6, 123:12, 133:13 explained [1] - 53:1 explaining [1] - 47:8 **expressive** [1] - 8:11 expressly [1] - 17:4 extended [3] - 96:17, 128:21, 128:24 extra [1] - 91:25 extremely [2] -115:15, 123:19 **Exxon** [1] - 89:6 eye [1] - 88:9 eyes [2] - 20:10, 50:23

## F

face [2] - 8:11, 88:7 facilities [3] - 13:14, 13:16, 109:2 facility [44] - 63:4, 66:9, 66:10, 66:12, 67:22, 68:4, 68:5, 84:5, 87:12, 87:16, 87:17, 91:15, 91:23, 92:12, 92:20, 93:3, 93:12, 94:14, 95:13, 95:23, 96:3, 96:4, 96:7, 99:17, 99:23, 100:14, 100:15, 100:23, 101:1, 101:22, 102:9, 103:2, 103:3, 103:22, 104:1, 108:2, 108:6, 108:16, 108:18, 109:9, 110:7, 111:16, 111:19 fact [35] - 10:4, 16:10, 16:13, 20:2, 24:20, 26:7, 34:20, 62:10, 63:25, 69:3, 69:23, 72:5, 75:17, 77:16, 80:9, 80:13, 83:11,

86:3, 91:20, 96:19, 103:8, 104:8, 105:6, 110:22, 111:11, 112:5, 115:22, 116:2, 122:9, 124:20, 129:11, 129:22, 130:20, 133:25

factor [2] - 10:6, 40:20

factors [5] - 30:1, 39:6, 39:10, 41:10, 41:20

facts [7] - 16:15, 34:6, 114:4, 116:5

facts [7] - 16:15, 34:6, 114:4, 116:5, 116:17, 120:19, 121:14

factually [1] - 35:25 failed [2] - 41:23, 42:16 fails [1] - 59:16

failure [5] - 20:4, 24:25, 45:8, 56:14, 56:15 faint [1] - 137:4

fair [3] - 8:12, 114:7,

134:21 fairly [1] - 18:9 familiar [4] - 28:20, 103:13, 118:13,

134:5

family [4] - 97:7, 97:20, 104:5, 115:6 family-run [1] - 104:5 far [1] - 80:21 fast [1] - 37:25

fatjo [2] - 34:2, 135:22 February [7] - 38:23, 44:13, 44:18, 51:15, 56:16, 65:23, 103:14 fed [1] - 97:20

federal [6] - 9:8, 9:11, 59:23, 65:17, 110:19, 124:7 fee [1] - 54:13

fees [7] - 50:3, 53:22, 53:25, 54:4, 106:3, 106:9, 127:14 feet [2] - 81:5, 81:6

**fell** [2] - 95:2, 96:17 **fellow** [2] - 122:12, 122:13

**few** [9] - 11:5, 18:16, 25:3, 33:14, 52:10, 63:14, 65:17, 93:24, 115:6

fiber [1] - 78:4 field [1] - 118:10 fight [1] - 115:17

**figure** [2] - 19:11, 93:13

figured [1] - 90:24 file [1] - 53:3 filed [1] - 96:18 files [2] - 73:10, 73:11 fill [2] - 6:17, 102:11 filled [5] - 29:19, 87:12, 87:13, 102:13, 103:3 filling [1] - 63:19

filling [1] - 63:19 final [2] - 49:11, 57:20 finally [2] - 99:7, 129:1 financial [2] - 35:5, 35:6

financially [1] - 39:15 finders [1] - 130:20 fine [3] - 8:13, 41:8, 42:5

**fined** [2] - 67:7, 67:9 **fines** [3] - 50:7, 50:11, 51:20

**fingerprint** [3] - 78:7, 78:9, 78:11

fingerprints [1] - 78:10 finished [1] - 89:7

fire [1] - 109:13 firm [3] - 50:4, 106:19,

106:20 **firmly** [3] - 81:11,

81:15, 130:14 FIRST [1] - 2:14 first [27] - 5:19, 6:11, 6:23, 8:5, 11:7,

11:15, 17:11, 17:12, 18:17, 22:15, 47:11, 56:6, 56:17, 78:12, 79:9, 84:9, 88:21, 88:24, 89:25, 90:1, 90:6, 90:24, 92:17, 109:22, 135:24,

138:24 **fiscal** [9] - 29:14, 103:12, 103:13, 103:15, 103:18,

104:6, 104:8, 104:13 **Fischer** [2] - 118:7,

118:9 **fits** [2] - 91:3, 115:14 **five** [2] - 79:1, 79:3

fixed [2] - 60:8, 79:18 float [1] - 77:25 flood [1] - 46:25

flooding [1] - 25:25 FLOOR [2] - 2:12, 4:6 Floor [1] - 140:24 flourishing [1] - 90:13

flow [1] - 45:18 fly [2] - 93:1, 97:18 fly-by-night [2] - 93:1,

97:18

focus [5] - 22:19, 117:1, 132:2, 132:3, 137:2 focused [1] - 65:19 folks [13] - 58:17, 60:14, 64:10, 66:11, 69:22, 86:1, 86:14, 88:22, 89:3, 93:19, 106:5, 117:19, 124:16 **follow** [7] - 23:21, 27:9, 33:8, 42:16, 57:2, 116:17, 138:12 follow-up [2] - 27:9, followed [3] - 62:5, 62:6, 63:24 following [6] - 1:19, 5:11, 55:9, 84:22, 107:18, 108:5 follows [1] - 24:18 foot [1] - 66:21 FOR [5] - 2:3, 2:17, 3:4, 3:14, 4:3 Ford [3] - 88:22, 102:25, 103:5 forecast [1] - 44:4 foregoing [3] - 30:8, 30:9, 140:6 foreign [1] - 61:14 forget [3] - 34:17, 34:18, 34:19 forgetting [1] - 28:12 forgotten [1] - 35:11 form [6] - 33:22, 116:1, 119:6, 131:16, 131:22, 136:24 **forma** [1] - 35:6 formation [4] - 32:12, 32:21, 33:12, 79:6 formed [1] - 21:12 former [1] - 87:3 forms [1] - 36:8 fortune [1] - 115:4 forward [9] - 14:21, 28:15, 50:17, 83:5, 84:16, 102:14, 115:16, 131:14, 138:17 four [3] - 12:5, 12:8, 112:11 fourth [1] - 64:12 frame [2] - 20:6, 64:20 framework [1] - 10:24 Francis [1] - 114:25 Freeway [2] - 59:24, 66:24 freeway [2] - 115:10, 125:1

frequently [1] - 59:18 friend [1] - 66:19 front [9] - 11:5, 33:17, 34:23, 54:2, 54:23, 94:3, 122:6, 127:7, 138:1 full [5] - 29:22, 32:3, 88:21, 104:1, 126:14 functions [1] - 12:10 fund [3] - 9:21, 9:22, 59:11 funds [5] - 62:4, 119:22, 120:1, 120:8, 127:14

# G

gain [1] - 118:10 game [1] - 89:25 Garland [1] - 90:7 Gaston [2] - 88:5, 88:11 gate [1] - 58:11 GC [6] - 34:2, 36:15, 36:20, 41:21, 43:3, 44:22 GCE [16] - 33:14, 33:19, 34:12, 36:16, 36:17, 36:21, 41:10, 41:14, 41:17, 105:1, 105:11, 116:23, 118:1, 134:9, 134:18, 136:19 GCE's [1] - 42:5 Gemini [1] - 88:19 GENERAL [2] - 2:18, 2:22 general [5] - 9:21, 9:22, 59:11, 62:4, 136:8 General [1] - 54:18 general's [2] - 52:17, 54:11 generals [1] - 52:16 generated [4] - 14:19, 15:19, 82:8 generating [1] -115:24 generator [1] - 82:8 gentleman [6] - 75:13, 81:12, 87:10, 92:1, 130:12, 132:13 gentlemen [9] - 5:5, 52:3, 55:5, 68:3, 80:25, 84:18, 109:21, 113:23, 138:22 **GEORGE** [1] - 2:8 **GIBBS** [2] - 3:5, 3:8

Gibbs [2] - 114:20,

115:21 gibbs [1] - 133:10 GIBSON [1] - 3:21 girl [1] - 88:8 **GIUGLIANO** [1] - 3:9 Giugliano [1] - 114:22 given [5] - 7:24, 23:10, 23:23, 79:14, 132:15 glad [1] - 85:5 gladfelter [1] - 99:1 glasses [1] - 88:9 Goleman [3] - 85:16. 85:17. 86:12 goleman [3] - 85:19, 86:8, 86:16 **golly** [1] - 112:24 **gooses** [1] - 66:25 gosh [2] - 136:21, 137:14 government [24] -12:5, 12:8, 26:7, 32:2, 57:3, 57:13, 64:19, 65:16, 65:17, 72:19, 75:5, 78:18, 78:22, 79:19, 79:25, 80:1, 82:22, 106:19, 110:19, 115:18, 116:12, 120:9, 120:18, 120:23 government's [3] -57:2, 57:4, 63:24 governmental [2] -86:9, 106:23 governments [1] -53:3 grade [8] - 45:23, 45:25, 46:6, 46:18, 46:24, 47:18, 64:12 grant [1] - 48:17 graphic [2] - 39:1, 96:11 grass [2] - 69:25, 101:5 grassroots [1] -133:14 grassroots-based [1] - 133:14 gray [1] - 85:11 **GRAY** [1] - 4:8 great [1] - 102:2 greater [1] - 78:15 groundwater [1] -81:5 group [1] - 138:5

grow [4] - 69:25, 70:1,

grows [1] - 102:12

guess [1] - 126:25

Gulf [2] - 31:22,

101:5

107:22

guys [2] - 17:13, 119:7 gyrations [1] - 121:12 Н

hallway [1] - 6:21 hand [1] - 140:17 handled [3] - 60:23, 60:24 handles [1] - 12:22 handling [8] - 17:6, 18:3, 18:7, 19:3, 19:7, 21:22, 23:5, 133:17 hands [1] - 78:10 hard [4] - 69:23,

harmful [4] - 10:2, HARRIS [4] - 1:4, 1:8, 2:3, 140:1 Harris [79] - 1:20, 9:21, 9:23, 10:16,

14:12, 17:3, 17:5, 27:6, 39:10, 40:7, 50:5, 51:14, 53:9, 60:2, 66:25, 71:1, 71:9, 75:10, 76:23, 77:9, 77:12, 78:5,

105:23, 105:25, 107:5, 109:1, 109:12, 109:16, 110:21, 115:22, 124:18, 124:23,

127:2, 129:25, 140:4, 140:23

hauled [6] - 29:15, 100:16, 137:7

hazard [1] - 136:9

hazardous [19] - 10:1,

half [1] - 127:14 96:17, 100:12, 101:4 38:19, 93:18, 135:17 11:22, 11:23, 11:25, 12:1, 12:12, 12:14, 12:16, 12:18, 13:25, 17:12, 17:15, 23:25, 42:4, 42:10, 42:12, 42:13, 42:15, 42:24, 48:15, 48:18, 50:2, 53:23, 57:14, 59:11, 80:13, 83:5, 85:25, 92:7, 102:19, 102:25, 103:10, 116:6, 122:6, 122:9, 125:5, 125:9, 126:3, 126:13, 126:15, 126:20, 127:1, haul [3] - 43:15, 73:1, 99:24 72:7, 84:10, 100:15, hauling [1] - 30:14

14:17, 14:22, 14:25, 15:8, 32:4, 32:7, 38:17, 39:19, 41:1, 49:14, 49:16, 76:10, 109:23, 113:20, 116:14, 120:13, 125:19, 132:10 hazards [1] - 137:9 head [2] - 7:9, 124:21 headquartered [1] -13:19 headquarters [1] -41:24 health [3] - 10:2, 38:19, 92:11 Health [3] - 17:5, 25:20, 92:7 hear [60] - 10:22, 10:25, 13:3, 14:25, 16:16, 17:14, 19:25, 20:12, 26:2, 30:21, 31:14, 35:16, 37:22, 38:5, 39:22, 41:13, 42:19, 43:9, 43:21, 43:22, 44:10, 44:15, 45:3. 46:4. 46:12. 56:21, 57:22, 57:25, 69:3, 70:19, 75:11, 82:21, 84:1, 85:12, 86:19, 90:17, 96:25, 99:14, 99:18, 108:8, 108:9, 110:2, 110:3, 111:23, 116:13, 116:15, 116:16, 121:15, 122:13, 123:10, 123:21, 126:17, 129:22, 130:18, 131:7, 131:13, 131:19, 133:8 heard [35] - 1:18, 13:10, 13:15, 13:16, 14:15, 32:5, 62:3, 68:19, 70:24, 78:17, 80:10, 87:8, 89:19, 90:16, 90:24, 100:8, 101:4, 107:20, 109:3, 109:10, 109:25, 110:13, 114:17, 116:10, 117:23, 118:17, 119:13, 120:10, 120:21, 120:25, 121:24, 132:4, 133:23, 134:13 hearing [6] - 11:4, 12:20, 13:1, 57:18, 74:18, 128:10

heartburn.. [1] -

118:22

heavily [2] - 94:9, 107:23 held [3] - 1:19, 89:25, 98:18 help [3] - 86:24, 86:25, 97.23 helped [2] - 61:19, 86:25 helping [1] - 74:20 helps [1] - 11:14 hereby [1] - 140:5 **high** [3] - 38:14, 89:7, 131:8 higher [1] - 100:5 highlighted [1] - 136:1 highway [3] - 27:13, 59:15, 87:5 Highway [7] - 16:19, 18:22, 23:2, 73:20, 87:6, 94:2, 95:21 himself [1] - 98:23 **HINTON** [3] - 4:8, 85:2, 85:5 Hinton [5] - 84:24, 114:10, 118:24, 134:12, 137:1 hire [1] - 86:10 hired [6] - 16:25, 63:9, 65:15, 72:10, 72:16, 83:13 historic [1] - 12:25 **historical** [1] - 87:1 history [4] - 45:21, 86:16, 87:1, 87:22 hit [1] - 90:1 hold [5] - 6:24, 7:2, 116:17, 132:25, 133:25 holder [2] - 98:5, 118:21 holding [2] - 99:11, 100:10 holds [1] - 75:12 home [2] - 90:2, 138:25 hometown [1] - 112:8 Honor [3] - 52:7, 55:18, 122:25 Honorable [1] - 1:19 hope [2] - 115:19, 121:19 hopefully [1] - 20:14 hoping [1] - 116:13 hour [2] - 54:20, 133:4 hourly [2] - 54:19, 54:20 hours [2] - 23:14, 54:17 house [4] - 33:21,

33:22, 61:8, 88:15

HOUSTON [5] - 2:6, 2:12, 3:6, 3:16, 4:6 Houston [19] - 1:20, 47:22, 47:23, 87:22, 88:2. 88:16. 89:1. 89:4, 89:11, 89:14, 89:25, 90:3, 90:10, 92:1, 97:16, 120:16, 133:10, 140:24 Houston-based [1] -133:10 huge [1] - 129:20 **Humble** [1] - 89:6 humidity [1] - 47:24 hundred [4] - 36:21, 36:23, 37:2, 121:10 hundreds [2] - 137:20, 138:5 hurricane [1] - 46:25 hydraulic [1] - 123:16 hydrology [1] - 44:16

ı

I-10 [6] - 11:9, 16:20, 38:15, 87:5, 118:12, 128:1 idea [2] - 5:15, 10:19 ideal [11] - 17:21, 18:22, 57:9, 62:20, 62:24, 73:20, 94:17, 94:18, 95:16, 95:23, 122:3 identical [2] - 37:13, 37:14 identified [5] - 25:22, 27:10, 38:14, 79:9, 80:11 identify [4] - 11:7, 11:14, 78:7, 120:25 ignore [1] - 116:16 imagination [1] -138:15 imagined [1] - 90:6 immediate [1] -127:25 immediately [1] -49:13 imminent [1] - 48:22 impact [1] - 81:1 impacting [1] - 81:8 imply [1] - 104:4 important [35] - 7:19, 19:13, 24:19, 55:2, 56:9, 56:10, 58:10, 58:17, 58:21, 58:24, 59:6, 59:7, 65:18, 66:7, 66:17, 93:10, 94:19, 94:22, 99:8, 99:17, 100:1,

122:23, 123:25, 125:16, 125:25, 130:23, 134:8 importantly [3] -114:24, 119:10, 119:13 impose [2] - 64:21, 110:5 imposed [1] - 48:13 imposes [1] - 43:25 impossible [5] -17:24, 18:25, 73:23, 95:7, 134:25 impoundment [13] -101:12, 101:13, 101:17, 102:14, 115:8, 115:25, 125:2, 125:9, 125:18, 127:7, 129:16, 129:21, 129:24 impoundments [16] -16:7. 42:25. 43:2. 45:19, 46:8, 51:6, 51:11, 71:7, 71:10, 71:13, 71:19, 71:22, 80:16, 95:10, 96:8, 122:11 impractical [3] -26:10, 26:16, 26:25 imprecise [1] - 132:17 impression [2] -101:10, 104:21 IN [1] - 1:4 **INC** [4] - 1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4 incineration [3] -76:19, 76:21, 79:15 include [1] - 131:17 included [1] - 140:9 includes [1] - 107:9 including [2] - 8:14, 129:20 income [1] - 37:17 incorporated [3] -36:12, 97:9, 98:11 incorporation [1] -98:20 increase [2] - 81:16, 130:15

incumbent [1] - 82:18

incur [2] - 35:9, 35:14

incurred [1] - 50:4

128:19, 131:8

independent [2] -

indeed [3] - 120:16,

115:12, 115:15,

120:14, 120:16,

118:1, 120:6,

122:4, 122:6,

9:17, 60:22 indicate [2] - 74:10, 131:3 indicated [2] - 92:22, 93:4  $indicating \ [2] - 27:13,\\$ 90.5 indicating) [7] - 27:18, 27:20, 31:11, 45:16, 47:10, 63:20, 124:24 indicative [1] - 129:23 indispensable [2] -1:6, 53:4 individual [1] - 55:14 individually [1] -129:14 individuals [2] -105:12, 111:18 indoor [1] - 90:2 industrial [6] - 48:21, 68:17, 75:8, 76:20, 76:21, 109:2 **Industrial** [6] - 13:6, 13:8, 34:10, 36:14, 85:14, 99:10 **INDUSTRIAL** [2] - 1:9, 4:4 industrialized [2] -94:9, 107:23 industries [2] - 90:15, 94:11 industry [7] - 32:11, 32:19. 50:18. 51:7. 75:8, 78:19, 79:16 infancy [2] - 86:23, 91:18 influx [1] - 90:11 information [12] -16:3, 23:13, 25:3, 25:24, 36:7, 36:11, 114:1, 118:11, 127:18, 128:16, 128:22, 130:16 informed [1] - 27:5 inherently [1] - 93:18 initial [1] - 56:4 injuries [1] - 40:8 input [1] - 62:22 inside [1] - 94:6 inspect [3] - 31:15, 35:20, 43:7 inspected [3] - 30:22, 63:15, 74:6 inspection [5] - 21:2, 21:4, 57:8, 113:2, 113:3 instruct [1] - 132:6 instructed [1] - 30:2

instruction [2] - 7:20,

68:24

instructions [10] - 5:6, 5:10, 5:13, 6:8, 7:18, 42:17, 58:22, 82:1, 82:3, 82:19 insurance [2] - 60:2, 60:8 intact [2] - 46:8, 51:11 intend [4] - 17:21, 18:23, 53:18, 73:21 intended [2] - 57:10, 94:18 intentionally [1] - 32:3 interest [5] - 23:20, 70:4, 70:5, 70:6, 70:9 interested [1] - 124:8 interesting [10] -36:13, 43:10, 55:23, 68:19, 69:22, 73:5, 83:25, 92:8, 102:22, 124:13 interim [1] - 35:6 internal [5] - 22:2, 25:19, 26:5, 26:14, 27:11 internally [1] - 118:16 INTERNATIONAL [2] -1:9, 3:14 International [21] -12:24, 13:2, 13:11, 37:21, 37:24, 39:2, 40:21, 41:5, 43:4, 43:11, 43:12, 44:23, 49:22, 58:14, 61:24, 71:16, 71:18, 82:2, 82:5, 82:23, 110:10 interpret [1] - 58:5 intersection [3] -112:13, 112:19, 113:6 Interstate [1] - 34:14 interviewing [1] -90:23 introduce [3] - 85:10, 114:18, 114:24 introduced [1] - 12:15 introduction [2] -10:23, 11:6 invested [1] - 107:12 investigated [2] -25:21, 138:11 investigation [3] - 9:9, 59:21, 119:16 investigator [1] -111:20 involved [27] - 13:12, 15:1, 40:16, 40:17, 57:22, 57:25, 58:3, 59:25, 60:1, 63:14, 72:20, 74:19, 80:20,

81:3, 83:15, 83:23, 92:4, 92:18, 97:16, 97:21, 110:11, 110:25, 111:14, 111:17, 111:18, 122:7, 124:3 involvement [7] -92:13, 109:17, 109:18, 121:18, 121:25, 122:2, 122:10 involving [1] - 59:20 **IP** [5] - 41:3, 41:5, 58:12, 61:3, 110:18 **IP's** [1] - 119:16 irrelevant [1] - 8:6 irritated [1] - 7:2 IRS [2] - 21:11, 96:19 issue [6] - 9:7, 70:2, 98:8, 104:16, 106:3, 125:14 issued [1] - 32:19 issues [5] - 54:6, 65:14, 66:8, 69:20, 131:14 item [1] - 136:1 items [1] - 103:9 itself [13] - 11:25, 31:2, 33:13, 33:18, 33:20, 56:12, 62:19, 62:20, 63:20, 77:23, 78:2, 121:15

#### J

Jacinto [60] - 11:13, 13:24, 15:7, 17:2, 17:25, 18:21, 19:1, 21:16, 21:21, 23:1, 24:22, 26:6, 26:11, 26:18, 27:1, 27:7, 27:22, 29:13, 30:13, 30:24, 31:17, 32:4, 33:3, 34:14, 36:25, 38:4, 38:15, 40:5, 40:25, 41:7, 42:18, 42:21, 45:12, 45:18, 45:20, 46:7, 47:1, 51:16, 56:23, 73:19, 73:24, 74:4, 77:13, 77:14, 79:24, 90:14, 94:2, 94:10, 95:8, 95:21, 100:16, 101:15, 107:19, 108:4, 109:6, 118:12, 127:20, 127:25, 136:7, 137:6 Jack [7] - 12:4. 122:13, 122:14, 122:22, 123:24,

3,

125:3, 128:24 Jack's [2] - 123:13, 128:21 January [3] - 34:3, 36:17, 124:1 jelly [3] - 19:16, 19:17, 19:18 jet [1] - 100:13 Joan [2] - 39:5, 44:20 **job** [6] - 6:25, 7:3, 28:22, 47:8, 54:16, 95:9 Joe [5] - 66:19, 66:21, 67:4, 118:7, 118:19 **John** [2] - 44:10, 45:3 **JOHN** [1] - 2:9 Johns [2] - 123:12, 131:1 joyous [1] - 103:23 **JPMORGAN** [1] - 2:5 Judge [8] - 1:19, 58:16, 58:22, 59:20, 60:20, 68:23, 70:19, 124:21 judge [16] - 6:1, 8:4, 12:6, 12:7, 14:15, 54:4, 54:6, 81:25, 110:4, 110:13, 124:18, 124:20, 125:5, 130:20, 132:6 judges [2] - 7:23, 130:20 JUDICIAL [1] - 1:11 Judy [1] - 90:7 July [11] - 9:25, 26:4, 26:15, 26:23, 27:11,

# Judy [1] - 90:7 July [11] - 90:5, 26:4, 26:15, 26:23, 27:11, 28:16, 32:8, 69:9, 69:10, 86:21, 102:8 jumped [1] - 138:9 June [7] - 14:7, 18:16, 20:8, 21:18, 22:24, 47:5, 73:17 juries [1] - 7:22 juror [2] - 6:16, 8:16 jurors [2] - 6:9, 7:23

55:22, 85:4, 114:14 **jury** [14] - 5:7, 5:10, 5:17, 6:15, 6:22, 7:13, 7:16, 55:1,

JURY [5] - 8:21, 52:9,

55:8, 67:14, 84:21, 114:8, 117:4, 138:4 Jury [1] - 5:3

jury's [1] - 48:12 justifiable [1] - 120:18

K

KAIM [1] - 3:9 Katy [1] - 66:24

keep [8] - 28:2, 61:16, 117:2, 120:7, 131:13, 133:19, 134:8, 134:22 keeping [1] - 7:17 keys [1] - 58:11 Kidd [3] - 140:3, 140:21, 140:21 Kimberly [3] - 140:3, 140:21, 140:21 **kind** [9] - 10:23, 21:17, 33:20, 74:21, 115:20, 117:2, 117:19, 136:12, 136:23 kinnan [1] - 85:16 knocking [1] - 84:12 knowing [1] - 91:25 knowledge [13] -64:15, 72:17, 83:9, 117:16, 118:17, 127:6, 127:7, 135:3, 137:21, 137:25, 138:1, 138:2, 138:3 knowledgeable [1] -75:14 known [7] - 14:21, 76:11, 76:22, 77:16, 78:25, 79:7, 124:22 knows [6] - 78:5, 79:19, 79:20, 79:25,

## L

Kraft [2] - 79:3, 79:4

80:1, 125:9

laced [1] - 15:5 lack [1] - 121:18 ladies [9] - 5:5, 52:3, 55:5, 68:2, 80:24, 84:18, 109:20, 113:22, 138:22 laid [1] - 117:19 land [39] - 16:20, 20:21, 29:24, 30:3, 31:2, 34:13, 34:18, 34:19, 35:1, 35:2, 35:10, 35:11, 35:15, 35:19, 69:16, 69:18, 69:22, 70:1, 70:8, 75:17, 81:5, 82:11, 84:6, 84:8, 93:22, 94:1, 94:5, 94:7, 98:3, 98:4, 107:21, 108:13, 108:19, 108:23, 118:12, 118:25, 119:3, 122:12, 136:6 landfill [1] - 133:12 lane [1] - 112:17

59:2, 59:5, 59:7, 60:12, 68:8, 68:22, 70:11, 129:4, 136:5, 136:13, 137:8 large [5] - 80:15, 80:22, 97:15, 130:5, 135:5 last [17] - 6:13, 10:15, 10:21, 14:10, 18:18, 18:19, 28:15, 33:16, 38:24, 50:14, 64:17, 65:17, 82:15, 82:16, 87:24, 114:2, 128:7 lasted [1] - 63:11 late [2] - 66:24, 138:19 law [22] - 8:7, 9:11, 15:6, 15:13, 24:1, 40:17, 41:7, 42:5, 43:16, 44:3, 59:23, 75:7, 85:10, 86:20, 91:24, 106:19, 106:20, 111:9, 112:10, 112:23, 116:17, 121:15 lawful [2] - 9:23, 83:17 Lawrence [3] - 34:8, 97:5, 104:8 laws [22] - 15:10, 35:4, 35:8, 35:10, 35:13, 35:14, 40:3, 40:10, 41:16, 53:3, 65:11, 88:11, 98:11, 105:17, 105:18, 110:1, 110:3, 112:2, 113:12, 136:14 lawsuit [10] - 8:12, 9:16, 9:19, 45:2, 60:7, 60:20, 60:21, 98:8, 104:16 lawyer [6] - 12:16, 57:19, 58:7, 80:12, 80:18, 136:13 lawyer's [1] - 10:19 lawyer/lobbyist [1] -86:9 lawyers [10] - 52:21, 52:24, 54:20, 59:10, 62:3, 80:12, 80:20, 89:18, 107:13, 122:5 lead [1] - 66:21 learn [1] - 108:9 leash [1] - 88:11 least [2] - 70:18, 70:19 leave [9] - 17:7, 18:4, 19:5, 21:24, 23:6, 30:19, 39:14, 40:22,

133:16

leaving [1] - 103:23

language [15] - 22:14,

22:17, 24:1, 34:3,

left [8] - 11:11, 14:14, 93:11, 96:11, 100:3, 101:9, 102:24, 104:21 legal [1] - 133:2 length [2] - 121:25, 137.2 less [1] - 107:6 letter [35] - 14:7, 14:8, 17:10, 17:19, 18:1, 18:10, 18:13, 19:12, 19:14, 19:19, 19:22, 19:25, 20:8, 22:7, 22:24, 23:12, 23:16, 24:11, 34:1, 40:1, 57:11, 62:14, 73:15, 80:10, 92:18, 92:21, 95:16, 95:20, 95:22, 127:17, 127:23, 135:22 letters [15] - 14:6, 17:9, 20:7, 20:11, 20:13, 20:15, 21:7, 22:16, 30:17, 36:5, 42:11, 57:11, 62:10, 92:15, 109:16 letting [1] - 16:8 levee [2] - 24:18, 96:7 levees [6] - 24:23, 25:4, 25:23, 45:9, 71:21 level [1] - 107:23 levels [4] - 38:15, 81:17, 92:9, 130:15 **LEWIS** [1] - 3:15 liabilities [1] - 136:12 liability [8] - 35:3, 35:5, 35:9, 35:14, 41:15, 43:17, 43:25, 138:14 liable [5] - 9:15, 28:8. 132:25, 134:14, 134:19 lien [1] - 96:19 light [1] - 112:14 limit [3] - 67:7, 67:8, 112:11 LINDA [1] - 2:21 lined [1] - 96:8 lines [1] - 134:7 lineup [1] - 44:9 liquid [8] - 18:4, 19:5, 21:24, 23:6, 30:18, 39:13, 40:22, 42:17 list [4] - 78:21, 124:14, 124:16, 125:6 listed [5] - 9:7, 9:25, 10:3, 32:7, 38:20 listen [12] - 7:11,

43:20, 72:23,

113:23, 113:24, 113:25, 114:1, 114:3, 114:7, 131:11, 131:12, 132:12 listening [2] - 57:1, 105:25 litigated [1] - 9:2 litigation [1] - 121:21 live [4] - 83:20, 83:22, 107:22, 111:11 **LLP** [5] - 2:4, 3:5, 3:15, 3:21, 4:5 local [5] - 53:2, 86:24, 92:9, 118:10, 124:7 locate [1] - 86:14 located [9] - 11:12, 18:20, 23:1, 45:15, 71:19, 73:18, 94:1, 95:20, 136:6 location [12] - 17:19, 18:15, 18:20, 26:11, 26:17, 27:1, 57:9, 62:24, 73:16, 73:17, 73:18, 115:25 locations [1] - 109:13 logic [1] - 138:12 long-established [1] -97:19 look [69] - 8:4, 8:13, 11:19, 15:11, 20:5, 38:2, 47:11, 57:10, 58:5, 60:11, 60:12, 61:7, 62:21, 65:10, 65:13, 66:4, 68:7, 68:10, 80:10, 84:15, 87:22, 88:2, 89:4, 89:10, 89:12, 94:21, 95:19, 100:2, 108:12, 108:17, 108:20, 109:20, 111:8, 118:7, 118:18, 119:2, 119:7, 121:20, 121:21, 122:19, 122:22, 123:6, 123:25, 124:14, 124:24, 125:22, 126:2, 126:6, 126:9, 127:11, 127:23, 128:7, 128:19, 129:13, 129:18, 135:10, 135:14, 135:23, 136:5, 136:16, 136:25, 137:4, 137:8, 137:15, 137:21, 137:22, 138:12, 138:17

looked [9] - 47:11,

64:11, 97:1, 103:10, 111:20, 130:4, 136:19, 136:20 looking [12] - 11:20, 31:23, 68:9, 81:10, 88:14, 90:19, 90:21, 95:17, 115:16. 126:9, 130:6, 137:11 looks [3] - 29:7, 80:15, 80:21 loose [1] - 88:10 lottery [2] - 105:21, 107:17 loud [2] - 18:19, 116:21 LOUISIANA [3] - 3:6, 3:15. 4:6 love [4] - 111:13, 111:15, 111:16, 111:17 low [2] - 16:22, 16:24 Loya [1] - 60:4 LSU [1] - 44:11 luck.. [1] - 118:15 lucky [1] - 88:23 lunch [6] - 66:23, 66:24, 66:25, 84:19, 85:6, 106:25

#### М

machine [2] - 1:21, 123:13 Main [3] - 112:9, 112:16 main [2] - 13:20, 112:20 maintain [11] - 20:5, 25:1, 31:15, 35:20, 43:7, 45:9, 56:14, 56:16, 69:2, 69:5, 82:12 maintained [3] -30:22, 70:3, 72:4 maintaining [1] -103:4 MAINTENANCE [2] -1:10, 4:4 Maintenance [6] -13:6, 13:9, 34:10, 36:14, 85:14, 99:10 maintenance [2] -91:16, 103:1 major [1] - 54:1 man [8] - 34:2, 75:5, 90:24, 90:25, 92:3, 95:9, 96:23, 97:10 managed [1] - 83:18 MANAGEMENT [4] -1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4

management [2] -26:9, 133:18 100:15, 100:16, Management [46] -100:18, 100:22, 100:24, 101:2, 13:5, 13:9, 13:15, 13:19, 28:10, 36:17, 101:11, 101:17, 36:18, 37:1, 37:2, 101:23, 102:10, 37:12, 37:14, 37:18, 102:12, 102:13, 102:16, 113:19, 41:21, 42:6, 43:3, 137:7 44:22, 49:24, materials [4] - 29:15, 114:25, 115:14, 115:23, 116:3. 116:7, 116:23. matter [5] - 39:12, 117:11, 117:16, 118:1, 118:5, 118:8, 137:13 119:6, 119:19, matting [1] - 101:8 119:25, 120:2, maximum [3] - 48:15, 120:4, 120:12, 49:20, 49:21 130:24, 132:23, 133:6, 133:9, MCGINNES [2] - 1:9, 133:15, 134:9, 134:17, 134:19, McGinnis [36] - 13:6, 135:1, 135:6, 136:4 13:8, 21:13, 31:3, Management's [2] -31:6, 34:8, 34:9, 28:11, 121:17 manager [1] - 118:10 97:4, 97:7, 97:10, manned [1] - 88:18 97:14, 98:2, 98:6, manner [6] - 17:6, 18:3, 19:4, 21:23, 23:5, 48:21 Mantle [1] - 90:1 104:9, 104:10, March [11] - 9:6, 32:9, 108:21, 111:13, 118:22, 119:1, 32:19, 35:19, 38:23, 44:14, 44:19, 57:7, 119:11, 119:12, 63:16, 74:1, 92:18 123:6 McGinnis' [2] - 31:7, mark [1] - 54:9 119:4 **MARK** [1] - 3:9 Mark [2] - 114:22, 123:12 marked [4] - 11:10, 121:20 meaning [1] - 69:15 22:8, 107:25, 122:24 marriage [1] - 134:5 means [6] - 13:4, married [1] - 97:4 32:13, 50:12, 53:5, marshy [2] - 16:22, 78:3, 126:24 meant [1] - 55:11 16:24 meet [1] - 85:16 mass [3] - 108:13, meeting [1] - 28:18 108:19, 108:23 Melanie [1] - 85:11 massive [2] - 120:19, 132:20 **MELANIE** [1] - 4:8 master's [1] - 75:7 members [3] - 13:17, material [49] - 21:5, 97:7, 117:4 22:6, 24:13, 25:13, memo [4] - 22:2, 25:6, 25:17, 26:23, 34:6, 25:19, 26:24 45:8, 45:22, 46:14, memorandum [4] -46:23, 56:20, 56:23, 24:6, 24:14, 27:3, 63:3, 63:6, 66:3, 27:9 69:23, 72:7, 73:1, memories [1] - 88:14 77:24, 83:18, 87:17, 93:10, 94:23, 95:1, memory [1] - 55:25 95:10, 96:12, 99:19,

99:21, 99:22, 99:24,

100:10, 100:12, 29:20, 74:4, 109:15 80:13, 98:16, 105:6, maximums [1] - 15:25 34:10, 36:13, 85:13, 98:7. 98:10. 98:15. 98:18, 98:25, 99:10, 99:24, 101:7, 103:8, McGinnises [1] - 99:5 mean [3] - 46:1, 64:25, memorized [1] - 92:16 mention [4] - 78:24, 109:10, 135:20,

137:9 mentioned [7] - 7:5, 53:22, 66:2, 70:25, 83:20, 92:11, 96:19 merely [1] - 103:24 merge [1] - 38:1 merged [9] - 13:1, 13:2, 36:18, 37:1, 37:21, 41:21, 116:23, 134:8, 134:17 merger [6] - 39:2, 39:4, 116:22, 117:25, 134:3, 138:7 merging [2] - 118:1, 134:9 met [2] - 92:19, 114:20 method [7] - 9:13, 57:5, 74:3, 74:11, 74:12, 92:22 methods [2] - 92:19, 125:11 meyer [1] - 49:7 Meyer [2] - 39:5, 44:20 Mickey [1] - 90:1 mid [3] - 45:10, 47:13, 97:9 mid-1970s [1] - 122:15 middle [1] - 89:5 miaht [8] - 8:3, 8:11. 43:2, 53:19, 78:23, 83:25, 88:22, 124:8 migrated [1] - 81:23 migration [1] - 81:22 miles [1] - 11:13 Mill [10] - 32:19, 33:7, 33:9, 33:10, 78:17, 78:18, 78:25, 79:2, 79:11 mill [34] - 13:24, 14:18, 15:8, 16:6, 17:1, 25:2, 27:24, 28:2, 30:25, 31:12, 31:16, 32:10, 40:1, 47:17, 50:24, 51:15, 62:9, 72:7, 73:2, 76:12, 77:24, 78:2, 78:20, 90:14, 90:20, 91:6, 92:20, 93:11, 99:12, 99:16, 99:23, 100:4, 109:4, 135:18 million [7] - 49:24, 50:4, 106:10, 107:9, 107:10, 107:12, 124:2 millions [10] - 33:25, 34:21, 36:6, 37:8, 41:18, 105:2, 123:21, 137:20, 138:5

mills [4] - 78:20, 78:24, 79:2, 79:4 MIMC [102] - 14:13, 14:18, 14:20, 21:12, 21:14, 21:15, 21:20, 23:12, 23:18, 23:24, 24:16, 28:5, 28:17, 32:1, 33:12, 33:18, 33:23, 35:17, 36:12, 36:13, 36:22, 36:23, 37:3, 37:7, 37:12, 37:13, 37:16, 39:13, 39:23, 40:2, 40:19, 40:23, 41:11, 41:12, 41:14, 41:23, 42:3, 42:16, 43:3, 43:11, 43:13, 44:22, 44:23, 49:23, 61:24, 62:8, 68:6, 83:17, 85:9, 85:12, 85:14, 85:21, 85:23, 86:14, 86:15, 87:1, 87:3, 98:10, 98:11, 98:15, 99:11, 99:16, 99:24, 102:7, 103:1, 103:11, 103:12, 103:17, 104:17, 104:18, 104:19, 105:1, 105:2, 105:3, 105:4, 105:8, 105:9, 105:12, 110:6, 110:8, 110:11, 110:18, 111:4, 113:13, 116:2, 116:4, 116:24, 119:3, 119:15, 119:16, 119:21, 119:22, 134:10, 134:14, 134:18, 134:20, 137:1 MIMC's [3] - 98:12, 105:2, 107:18 mimic [1] - 37:19 mind [11] - 24:8, 65:14, 70:18, 70:20, 117:2, 118:9, 120:7, 130:22, 131:13, 134:9, 134:22 minds [1] - 94:21 mine [1] - 55:15 Mining [1] - 131:7 mining [11] - 80:4, 80:24, 81:16, 108:9, 108:15, 122:16, 128:2, 128:8, 130:14, 131:6 minute [9] - 14:7, 26:8, 32:25, 43:5, 55:6, 57:16, 76:7, 78:14, 120:20

minutes [7] - 28:20, 98:22, 103:11, 103:17, 104:14, 104:23, 137:1 Mississippi [1] - 89:9 Mockingbird [3] -112:9, 112:17, 112:20 moment [2] - 27:14, 74:13 momentarily [1] -116:25 money [7] - 9:19, 9:20, 9:22, 29:7, 29:8, 29:21, 116:13 months [5] - 63:14, 74:22, 87:11, 112:13, 115:6 MORGAN [1] - 3:15 morning [12] - 5:5, 10:11, 52:8, 52:9, 138:24, 139:2 104:12 motion [1] - 30:9 mouth [1] - 74:4

monument [1] - 11:13 52:22, 52:25, 53:7, 55:24, 58:16, 104:7, most [6] - 7:19, 16:11, 74:13, 92:23, 93:4, motor [2] - 67:6, 67:15 move [7] - 9:4, 20:14, 23:9. 61:16. 87:13. 117:21, 131:2 moved [4] - 81:21, 100:22, 102:14, 131:5 **moves** [1] - 49:5 moving [4] - 21:18, 28:16, 67:7, 99:16 MR [27] - 2:7, 2:8, 2:9, 2:14, 2:21, 3:8, 3:8, 3:9, 3:9, 3:10, 3:11, 3:17, 3:18, 3:18, 3:19, 3:23, 10:11, 10:13, 22:14, 52:6, 52:10, 55:18, 55:20, 55:23, 114:12, 114:15, 123:2 MS [7] - 2:8, 2:21, 3:10, 4:8, 4:8, 85:2, 85:5 MUIR [1] - 2:9 multi [1] - 121:13 multi-billion-dollar [1] - 121:13 multiple [2] - 120:24,

121:7

121:7

multiply [2] - 121:3,

municipal [1] - 76:19 music [1] - 88:25 musical [1] - 90:8 must [4] - 15:15, 15:22, 44:2, 46:1 Mustang [1] - 88:22

#### Ν

N.W [1] - 3:21 name [13] - 31:6, 36:13, 64:10, 70:24, 81:12, 85:16, 90:24, 90:25, 114:15, 119:4, 120:2, 130:11 named [2] - 91:7, 122:13 names [3] - 90:17, 91:3, 109:23 nation [1] - 88:17 native [1] - 96:24 nature [12] - 22:4, 25:11, 25:15, 26:21, 35:8, 35:12, 41:16, 93:10, 95:23, 100:9, 100:20, 136:14 navigable [1] - 42:22 near [5] - 16:23, 16:24, 89:2, 118:12, 128:1 necessary [2] - 1:6, 53:4 necessity [2] - 18:6, 19:7 ned [1] - 23:10 need [23] - 8:15, 14:11, 20:10, 22:5, 24:17, 25:12, 26:21, 44:7, 47:2, 53:21, 58:5, 59:12, 59:13, 74:15, 74:16, 77:18, 106:25, 120:1, 121:16, 135:5, 136:21, 136:22, 137:15 needed [3] - 25:14, 25:16, 28:1 **needs** [2] - 65:19, 119:22 neighborhoods [1] -50:19 **NELSON** [1] - 3:23 nervous [1] - 8:2 never [12] - 47:1, 61:8, 66:12, 69:4, 70:2, 78:14, 84:7, 89:19, 90:6, 111:10, 116:4, 116:5

nevertheless [1] -

120:4

new [7] - 64:20, 99:5, 99:20, 99:21, 113:11 next [14] - 11:5, 16:21, 18:13, 20:5, 23:14, 45:13, 48:18, 79:11, 93:24, 122:11. 127:11, 127:23, 128:12, 128:19 night [3] - 93:1, 97:18, 102:17 nine [1] - 112:13 **NO** [1] - 1:2 nobody [6] - 31:23, 113:20, 115:22, 116:14, 120:12 noise [2] - 7:9, 7:11 nominal [2] - 30:5, 127:13 none [9] - 47:17, 50:23, 51:5, 57:24, 91:17, 94:20, 118:13, 118:14, 120:8 north [9] - 11:9, 16:20, 18:21, 23:2, 73:19, 87:5, 94:1, 95:21, 127:20 northwest [3] -129:16, 129:21, 131:4 note [3] - 92:8, 94:19, 128:8 noted [2] - 35:7, 81:17 notes [1] - 55:25 nothing [21] - 8:12, 15:4, 24:23, 39:17, 39:19, 39:24, 40:3, 41:17, 41:22, 56:3, 56:11, 60:18, 104:1, 105:11, 109:19, 111:5, 116:4, 128:15, 128:18, 135:19, 136:18 notice [7] - 35:2, 123:25, 124:6, 124:17, 124:25, 126:22, 126:23 noticed [1] - 127:17 **notices** [1] - 126:15 notification [1] - 42:24 notified [1] - 23:11 number [9] - 12:2, 50:11, 80:6, 90:22, 97:15, 122:20, 126:11, 134:23 numbered [2] - 1:18,

140:10

numbers [1] - 107:7

numerous [1] - 109:16

#### 0

o'clock [1] - 59:14 O'Rourke [1] - 12:17 object [3] - 6:20, 124:10, 126:21 objected [1] - 127:2 objection [4] - 126:15, 127:9, 128:24, 129:2 objections [2] -126:12, 126:25 obligation [4] - 69:2. 82:12, 103:1, 103:3 **obnoxious** [1] - 7:10 **obtain** [1] - 135:4 obtained [2] - 41:12, 62:22 obviously [4] - 11:2, 11:3, 19:12, 133:24 occasions [1] - 95:15 occurred [6] - 56:17, 73:12, 73:13, 84:10, 108:19, 140:11 occurring [1] - 69:18 occurs [2] - 49:18, 76:20 **OCTOBER** [2] - 1:15, October [4] - 1:18, 73:6, 129:1, 140:18 **OF** [11] - 1:1, 1:4, 1:4, 1:11, 2:11, 2:17, 2:18, 3:4, 140:1, 140:1 offer [1] - 140:15 offered [1] - 140:16 **OFFICE** [2] - 2:11, 2:18 office [5] - 23:12, 52:18, 54:9, 54:11, 75:23 officer [8] - 37:17, 57:7, 57:14, 62:18, 64:8, 67:1, 92:4 officers [2] - 37:13 offices [1] - 37:18 Official [2] - 140:3, 140:22 official [3] - 12:3, 75:5, 124:21 officials [2] - 38:14, 124:8 often [1] - 113:16 old [5] - 105:21, 107:17, 127:19, 127:22, 137:3 Ole [21] - 17:1, 20:16, 21:10, 21:15, 62:7, 62:11, 90:23, 91:2, 91:5, 91:11, 91:21,

93:6, 93:16, 93:21, 96:1, 96:16, 96:21, 97:12, 97:22, 98:1, 99:9 ON [1] - 1:5 once [7] - 77:22, 87:8, 95:22, 101:12, 103:2, 109:7, 119:14 one [62] - 7:7, 12:2, 12:5, 12:8, 12:17, 14:11, 15:10, 17:12, 18:8, 18:11, 18:14, 19:15, 19:22, 20:20, 25:3, 26:2, 27:18, 27:21, 28:4, 29:5, 31:3, 34:14, 45:21, 46:13, 47:4, 48:24, 50:11, 50:19, 50:21, 51:3, 55:11, 66:23, 69:19, 70:14, 70:25, 76:12, 76:13, 79:18, 80:11, 80:15, 80:16, 80:22, 81:14, 82:21, 83:1, 83:7, 88:6, 88:23, 90:6, 95:18, 102:22, 103:10, 105:16, 119:21, 121:5, 125:17, 130:5, 134:23, 135:24 ones [2] - 46:2, 89:13 ongoing [7] - 9:12, 9:19, 36:24, 37:4, 61:4, 103:1, 119:17 onshore [4] - 66:9, 66:10, 67:21, 68:3 open [2] - 80:3, 140:11 opened [2] - 89:18, 89:21 opening [15] - 5:9, 5:19, 5:21, 9:5, 10:10, 51:25, 52:4, 55:7, 57:20, 59:3, 85:7, 103:10, 109:4, 124:19, 135:12 **OPENING** [5] - 10:12, 52:5, 55:19, 85:1, 114:12 operate [2] - 84:5, 92:12 operated [5] - 39:2, 80:7, 105:19, 122:12 operating [9] - 20:24, 28:2, 37:16, 66:12, 67:15, 104:18, 105:13, 133:9 operation [45] - 17:6, 18:3, 19:4, 21:22, 22:5, 25:12, 25:15,

26:21, 33:12, 56:4, 56:12, 57:12, 57:23, 61:19, 61:23, 63:1, 63:10, 68:6, 68:13, 72:12, 72:13, 72:20, 74:9, 74:17, 75:2, 75:15, 76:3, 80:8, 83:17, 87:11, 91:13, 93:1, 96:22, 97:19, 99:5, 101:23, 102:19, 104:19, 108:15, 108:18, 109:22, 133:14 operations [20] -13:20, 23:5, 28:3, 30:18, 34:18, 37:8, 37:10, 56:8, 64:2, 85:24, 86:5, 101:22, 102:4, 103:2, 103:22, 108:16, 110:7, 110:10, 117:24, 133:12 operator [8] - 66:9, 67:6, 67:7, 67:11, 67:15, 67:21, 68:3, 87:4 opinion [5] - 17:17, 47:6, 74:6, 100:9, 131:10 opportunity [5] -111:23, 115:16, 126:21, 126:22, 126:24

opposing [3] - 133:4,

135:12, 135:22

order [2] - 100:21,

orders [1] - 8:10

organic [1] - 77:24

organizations [1] -

orient [1] - 115:5

74:19, 100:23

original [2] - 74:19,

originally [3] - 41:11,

ourselves [2] - 94:20,

outlined [1] - 27:14

outside [5] - 5:24,

106:19, 106:20

overreaching [1] -

overseeing [1] - 9:9

overseen [1] - 119:16

oversight [1] - 95:13

overuse [1] - 20:13

owed [1] - 96:20

6:23, 106:18,

105:9

126:11

82:24

94:21

116:11

opposite [1] - 131:5

# Ρ

Owen [1] - 80:11

80:19, 130:3

Owens [3] - 12:15,

**OWENS** [1] - 2:14

owens [1] - 130:6

owes [1] - 42:6

135:7

own [20] - 15:16,

15:18, 24:2, 26:5,

40:22, 43:13, 43:14,

43:18, 68:14, 69:1,

69:16, 69:21, 71:5,

71:18, 72:15, 82:11,

84:5, 102:25, 103:5,

owned [18] - 23:23,

29:12, 30:12, 31:8,

66:14, 68:1, 72:3,

103:8, 116:24,

118:25, 119:3,

122:12, 134:18

67:21, 70:6, 98:7

owners [2] - 33:24,

ownership [8] - 13:8,

36:22, 37:3, 66:7,

66:8, 66:17, 84:6,

owns [2] - 34:13,

34:11

84:7

136:6

owner [4] - 66:9,

118:11, 118:14,

34:17, 43:11, 43:17,

**p.m** [2] - 23:9, 59:24 **P.O** [1] - 2:19 page [4] - 36:8, 124:14, 127:23, 128:7 Page [2] - 136:2, 136:20 paid [12] - 9:11, 9:21, 28:5, 28:19, 30:25, 40:18, 43:15, 50:13, 59:22, 98:22, 105:3, 105:9 pairing [1] - 90:8 panel [1] - 13:17 PAPER [2] - 1:9, 3:14 Paper [24] - 12:24, 12:25, 13:2, 37:21, 37:24, 39:2, 40:21, 43:4, 43:11, 43:12, 44:23, 49:22, 58:14, 61:24, 71:16, 71:18, 82:3, 82:5, 82:23, 90:13, 93:6, 100:11, 110:11 paper [46] - 13:24,

17:1, 25:2, 27:24, 30:25, 31:12, 31:16, 32:10, 32:11, 38:7, 38:8, 38:11, 39:25, 41:6, 47:17, 50:24, 51:10, 51:15, 62:9, 72:7, 73:2, 76:12, 77:24, 78:2, 78:18, 78:20, 78:24, 79:1, 79:16, 90:14, 90:20, 91:6, 92:20, 93:11, 99:12, 99:16, 99:23, 100:4. 109:4. 135:18, 136:9, 137:9 Paper's [2] - 13:11, 41:9 papers [1] - 75:13 paragraph [13] - 18:1, 18:8, 18:9, 18:11, 18:17, 19:14, 19:15, 19:22, 22:15, 22:16, 25:10, 34:13 **Paragraph** [1] - 19:2 paragraphs [2] -17:18, 19:19 Pardue [3] - 44:10, 47:6, 132:13 Pardue's [1] - 45:4 parents [1] - 115:10 parents' [1] - 88:15 Parks [1] - 81:13 parks [5] - 127:16, 127:20, 128:17, 130:9, 130:12 part [17] - 29:14, 38:12, 39:4, 54:1, 57:23, 58:12, 59:9, 59:10, 62:1, 70:1, 70:7, 70:8, 76:12, 78:1, 79:9, 127:13, 135:3 partially [1] - 17:22 participate [2] - 55:3, 119:22 participating [4] -9:14, 53:11, 113:17, 113:18 particular [7] - 18:13, 70:10, 79:22, 81:8, 81:20, 82:14, 110:3 particularized [1] -31:19 particularly [4] - 7:8, 17:22, 18:23, 73:21 parties [7] - 11:21, 14:16, 32:6, 93:18, 95:12, 113:17, 140:9 partner [4] - 85:11,

114:20, 114:22,

14:18, 15:8, 16:6,

115:21 parts [1] - 6:25 party [7] - 1:7, 9:15, 53:4, 120:3, 125:20, 127:12, 127:13 pass [1] - 11:11 passed [3] - 105:18, 110:6, 112:23 passenger [3] - 67:3, 67:5, 67:10 past [4] - 86:8, 86:15, 127:1, 127:6 patience [1] - 138:19 Patricia [1] - 81:15 **PAULA** [1] - 4:8 pay [14] - 15:15, 15:22, 28:3, 40:12, 40:13, 40:19, 44:2, 48:9, 49:1, 49:16, 50:21, 51:3, 51:19, 98:21 payments [2] - 9:18, 60:17 peanut [4] - 19:16, 19:17, 19:21 pen [1] - 11:10 penalized [1] - 135:2 penalties [24] - 28:8, 40:9, 44:24, 48:16, 49:8, 49:20, 49:21, 49:23, 49:25, 50:7, 50:11. 51:20. 53:9. 77:20, 105:22. 105:24, 106:15, 110:5, 110:9, 110:23, 111:7, 114:6, 117:3, 135:5 penalty [33] - 9:18, 15:15, 15:23, 27:23, 28:3, 35:18, 38:21, 38:22, 38:24, 39:12, 40:12, 40:13, 40:18, 44:2, 48:9, 48:17, 49:1, 49:16, 53:7, 60:16, 65:22, 65:25, 75:25, 84:9, 117:5, 120:19, 120:21, 126:5, 132:7, 132:20, 134:23, 134:25 pending [2] - 35:3, 136:11 penetrating [1] -129:23 people [25] - 7:21, 8:1, 14:22, 31:20, 33:20, 36:8, 36:9, 36:10, 40:8, 43:5, 57:22, 57:24, 58:3, 76:23, 83:22, 90:22, 99:25,

104:12, 111:22, 113:24, 118:13, 121:21, 124:8, 130:11 per [2] - 28:8, 48:11 percent [12] - 36:21, 36:23, 37:2, 98:24, 99:1. 106:15. 106:16, 106:22, 107:6, 107:8 perfect [1] - 137:25 performance [2] -70:16, 88:24 performances [1] performed [2] - 9:10, 59:22 **performing** [1] - 74:8 perhaps [1] - 130:12 period [31] - 15:24, 16:1, 16:3, 16:12, 16:14, 32:22, 33:10, 35:18, 36:25, 38:22, 38:25, 41:4, 43:1, 46:9, 49:4, 49:9, 57:19, 65:6, 65:20, 65:25, 87:21, 89:2, 89:17, 90:4, 110:9, 116:5, 117:24, 120:10, 132:10, 133:24 periods [8] - 16:1, 27:21, 31:23, 37:10, 37:15, 49:6, 49:9, 65:22 permanently [1] - 9:13 permit [21] - 15:14, 15:20, 44:1, 48:8, 48:20, 68:17, 68:21, 68:25, 69:14, 70:15, 87:15, 91:24, 95:12, 95:25, 123:3, 123:24, 126:16, 128:21, 128:24, 129:5, 129:12 permits [10] - 43:16, 50:2, 50:6, 64:4, 87:15, 91:20, 92:11, 122:15, 122:17, 128:15 permitted [2] - 41:6, 43:19 permitting [3] - 91:15, 91:19, 124:4 person [9] - 12:7, 66:9, 66:14, 67:21, 68:4, 68:16, 69:13, 70:14, 70:17 personal [2] - 40:8, 57:8

personnel [1] - 131:20 perspective [3] - 24:1, 87:1, 115:11 Peterson [21] - 17:1, 20:16, 21:10, 21:15, 62:8, 62:11, 90:23, 91:2, 91:5, 91:11, 91:21, 93:7, 93:16, 93:21, 96:1, 96:17, 96:21, 97:13, 97:22, 98:1, 99:9 Ph.D [1] - 75:7 phase [2] - 125:1 Phil [2] - 44:15, 45:6 PHONE [7] - 2:6, 2:13, 2:20, 3:7, 3:16, 3:22, photo [9] - 16:17, 63:13, 63:16, 63:18, 107:25, 108:13, 108:17, 115:3, 129:15 photograph [2] -11:12, 11:15 photographs [10] -11:18, 11:19, 31:18, 31:21, 31:22, 31:25, 50:15, 50:17, 81:22, 94:21 photos [3] - 63:12, 80:13, 93:24 phrase [4] - 89:19, 116:14, 116:16, 121:19 physical [3] - 29:17, 29:23, 78:1 physically [1] - 46:7 picked [1] - 66:23 pictorial [1] - 35:23 picture [8] - 36:11, 45:14, 51:8, 64:11, 75:3, 88:12, 89:10, 109:8 pictures [6] - 36:9, 87:7, 89:4, 96:5, 100:2, 107:20 piece [5] - 7:7, 79:21, 86:14, 93:22, 123:20 pieces [2] - 25:3, 47:4 pile [1] - 113:5 piled [1] - 49:19 pinpoint [1] - 79:21 pipes [1] - 100:25 pit [10] - 11:10, 27:18, 27:20, 27:23, 28:18, 33:2, 105:21, 107:17, 109:4 pits [41] - 13:25,

14:14, 14:20, 15:2,

16:23, 17:2, 17:4,

17:17, 21:16, 21:20, 24:21, 27:12, 27:15, 27:17, 27:22, 28:4, 28:6, 28:14, 31:24, 32:3, 33:7, 33:24, 35:25, 38:3, 38:11, 39:14, 39:18, 39:20, 40:22, 42:14, 43:6, 43:7, 43:8, 45:8, 47:14, 50:25, 56:19, 56:20, 74:20, 127:19, 127:22 place [11] - 28:1, 30:25, 65:11, 87:23, 97:3, 116:22, 118:3, 133:16, 133:19, 133:20, 135:2 placed [5] - 14:20, 31:12, 38:3, 39:17, 66:3 Plaintiff [1] - 1:4 plaintiff [6] - 5:18, 5:19, 5:21, 6:12, 96:19 **PLAINTIFF** [2] - 2:3, plaintiffs [1] - 6:11 plans [1] - 126:14 plant [1] - 115:7 playing [1] - 115:9 pocket [1] - 116:12 **POGGE** [1] - 3:10 point [25] - 20:14, 25:9, 34:15, 35:9, 35:13, 38:16, 61:2, 61:18, 63:22, 67:19, 68:5, 71:1, 78:16, 88:2, 90:15, 92:8, 94:6, 94:12, 97:6, 98:14, 99:2, 99:15, 105:7, 137:16, 138:16 pointed [2] - 24:17, 29:18 points [2] - 58:10, 92:21 **polluting** [1] - 26:6 pollution [15] - 15:7, 15:14, 15:21, 26:10, 26:16, 26:24, 27:6, 27:10, 40:11, 40:15, 43:19, 44:1, 48:8, 79:24, 126:19 Pollution [10] - 12:12, 17:12, 17:15, 75:10, 75:19, 75:20, 75:23, 75:24, 86:20, 92:7 pond [9] - 17:20, 18:15, 18:20, 23:2, 73:17, 73:18, 74:3,

100:6, 101:18 ponds [3] - 21:21, 40:24, 100:10 porch [1] - 88:14 portion [8] - 12:14, 22:18, 24:9, 47:12, 50:7, 80:15, 80:22, 130:5 portions [7] - 22:8, 22:12, 25:7, 47:14, 80:16, 140:7 position [19] - 41:9, 41:25, 42:13, 43:12, 43:14, 46:3, 46:5, 46:22, 47:16, 50:20, 51:2, 51:9, 51:14, 56:2, 56:24, 71:4, 75:11, 75:23, 97:24 Possum [1] - 96:25 potential [4] - 41:15, 107:8, 107:13, 127:24 potentially [3] -113:20, 128:3, 138:9 power [10] - 24:3, 68:21, 68:22, 68:25, 69:15, 70:20, 72:2, 82:5, 82:6, 82:9 PowerPoint [1] -87:19 practically [4] - 17:24, 18:25, 73:23, 95:7 practice [2] - 25:21, 54:11 practiced [1] - 114:21 practicing [1] - 111:9 precaution [3] - 25:12, 25:16, 26:22 precautions [1] - 22:5 precinct [1] - 12:4 precincts [1] - 12:5 precise [1] - 59:2 precisely [1] - 68:9 predecessor [1] - 76:3 predict [1] - 82:3 prepared [1] - 63:6 preparing [1] - 91:12 presence [5] - 5:24, 6:23, 10:4, 38:20, 127:24 Present [1] - 5:3 present [8] - 26:11, 26:17, 26:25, 29:25, 44:24, 55:8, 74:20, 84:21 presentation [3] -15:3, 28:13, 68:20 presentations [1] -43:21

presented [1] - 122:21

presenting [2] - 84:16, 138:17 president [2] - 98:25, 104:9 Presiding [1] - 1:19 presiding [3] - 6:16, 8:9 Preston [1] - 125:6 pretty [4] - 11:18, 20:9, 94:9, 112:11 prevent [1] - 30:23 preview [3] - 115:20, 129:9, 131:1 previously [2] - 30:13, 109:3 price [1] - 34:7 **primarily** [1] - 79:5 primary [1] - 53:11 private [2] - 24:14, 54:11 pro [2] - 35:6, 124:11 problem [10] - 26:10, 26:16, 26:24, 27:7, 33:22, 43:23, 65:8, 79:17, 83:6, 137:14 problems [3] - 21:11, 25:22, 27:10 proceed [6] - 5:8, 6:10, 10:9, 55:6, 55:17, 84:24 Proceedings [1] -1:21 proceedings [6] -1:19, 5:11, 55:9, 84:22, 140:8, 140:14 process [30] - 5:15, 8:2, 8:23, 9:12, 9:14, 9:18, 32:12, 32:20, 40:16, 58:13, 59:19, 60:9, 60:22, 62:2, 62:16, 74:24, 74:25, 76:13, 77:18, 77:23, 79:4, 79:5, 79:10, 79:13, 82:25, 92:5, 119:17, 119:23, 123:23, 124:4 processing [2] -93:11, 128:8 produced [3] - 1:21, 27:25, 109:11 producing [1] - 32:17 product [3] - 13:12, 51:10, 77:3 production [1] - 88:21 products [3] - 13:13, 38:8, 38:9 professional [1] -83:17 professor [2] - 44:11, 44:16

program [1] - 88:19 project [1] - 88:19 projector [1] - 55:13 projects [2] - 97:15, 108:11 promise [1] - 18:18 pronounce [1] -130:11 proof [3] - 5:18, 6:13, 140:16 proper [1] - 93:14 properties [1] - 41:13 property [36] - 15:17, 15:18, 17:7, 18:5, 19:5, 21:24, 22:25, 23:6, 29:18, 29:19, 31:10, 40:2, 40:8, 60:1, 66:13, 66:14, 66:15, 67:25, 68:14, 69:1, 70:4, 70:8, 70:21, 71:18, 72:3, 93:3, 98:10, 98:21, 103:8, 108:22, 118:21, 118:25, 119:2, 119:8, 119:14, 131:6 proposed [5] - 17:19, 18:20, 73:18, 92:22, 126:21 prosperity [1] - 90:12 PROTECTION [1] -Protection [1] - 9:7 protection [1] - 52:17 proud [1] - 106:4 prove [2] - 132:5, 132:19 provide [1] - 119:22 provided [2] - 21:3, 119:20 provides [3] - 41:8, 42:5. 53:24 **province** [1] - 39:8 **public** [9] - 10:2, 26:7, 32:2, 38:19, 41:23, 123:25, 124:5, 124:7, 124:25 published [1] - 79:12 **pull** [1] - 62:13 pulled [2] - 26:14, 95:19 pulls [1] - 67:1 pulp [4] - 32:20, 77:24, 78:2, 79:5 pulp-bleaching [2] -32:20, 79:5 pump [2] - 100:13, 101:16 pumped [2] - 81:6, 101:20

punish [4] - 59:8, 61:25, 117:4, 117:6 punished [1] - 126:6 punishment [1] -117:9 purchase [2] - 34:7, 105:10 purchased [8] - 36:15, 36:16, 41:11, 61:3, 61:4, 105:1, 105:3, 108:21 purchasing [1] - 38:12 purpose [5] - 9:23, 17:21, 18:22, 73:20, 94:18 purposely [1] - 39:14 purposes [5] - 57:9, 102:10, 103:21, 103:22, 104:3 pursuant [2] - 34:5, 93:21 pursuing [1] - 121:14 **push** [1] - 7:8 pushed [1] - 102:11 **pushing** [1] - 65:3 put [45] - 5:22, 7:9, 11:3, 11:5, 13:22, 13:24, 16:5, 16:23, 16:24, 17:3, 25:9, 25:18, 26:8, 28:1, 33:16, 37:11, 44:5, 46:23, 47:11, 47:21, 51:4. 51:23. 56:14. 63:5, 64:20, 65:6, 66:13, 87:19, 87:21, 93:25, 96:13, 96:20, 99:20, 100:13, 100:19, 100:21, 100:22, 101:8, 101:21, 112:22, 113:8, 131:14 **puts** [2] - 5:21, 112:15 putting [12] - 16:6, 16:9, 17:17, 20:3, 35:23, 35:24, 36:7, 53:17, 56:18, 56:20, 87:17, 104:22

#### Q

qualifications [2] -45:4, 45:6 QUALITY [1] - 1:6 Quality [1] - 70:13 quality [3] - 52:13, 52:15, 53:2 Quebedeaux [37] -17:5, 17:11, 21:19, 23:18, 24:17, 30:16, 57:23, 64:7, 73:10,

74:1, 74:5, 74:18, 75:3, 76:2, 83:24, 92:1, 92:2, 92:3, 92:14, 92:18, 92:21, 93:4, 94:15, 94:17, 94:23, 94:24, 95:4, 95:5, 96:1, 96:8, 96:10, 102:20, 109:11, 111:17, 125:10 Quebedeaux's [2] -42:17, 122:2 **QUESTION** [1] - 127:1 **questioned** [1] - 46:15 questions [6] - 6:2, 6:9, 6:15, 6:17, 8:22, 83:24 quick [1] - 118:20 quickly [2] - 61:16, 117:21 quite [3] - 20:12, 29:22, 79:19 quote [2] - 26:8, 26:13

#### R

Radloff [1] - 81:15 rain [1] - 47:20 rains [1] - 77:6 raise [1] - 126:11 raised [1] - 123:17 ran [2] - 21:6, 21:10 random [1] - 78:22 range [2] - 15:23, 123:2 ranging [1] - 40:12 rate [3] - 54:19, 54:20 rather [2] - 7:13, 77:25 reaching [1] - 65:1 react [1] - 8:4 reacting [1] - 8:11 read [17] - 5:6, 5:7, 5:10, 6:6, 8:25, 9:3, 14:6, 14:9, 18:19, 20:11, 21:8, 22:22, 58:15, 58:16, 110:13, 122:20, 134:4 ready [2] - 87:20, 139:2 real [16] - 29:12, 30:12, 45:7, 66:4, 115:12, 120:22, 121:18, 121:19, 121:23, 125:15, 126:10, 127:10, 130:3, 130:16, 133:1, 137:6 realize [3] - 22:4, 25:11, 26:20

really [8] - 5:25, 54:24, 111:9, 121:7, 121:9, 132:2, 138:7, 138:15 reason [8] - 7:20, 8:3, 59:7. 66:18. 116:20. 133:6. 137:12. 137:13 reasonable [9] -49:13, 50:2, 54:3, 54:7, 54:12, 54:19, 54:21, 126:9, 126:10 reasonableness [3] -126:4, 128:13, 137:23 Reasoner [3] - 114:11, 114:15, 138:21 **REASONER** [4] - 3:8, 114:12, 114:13, reasons [4] - 61:13, 105:16, 125:14, 125:16 rebuttal [1] - 6:13 received [6] - 35:2, 122:15, 122:17, 124:17, 125:6, 126:14 receiving [4] - 34:7, 95:24, 95:25, 128:16 recent [2] - 81:11, 81:16 recently [2] - 80:14, 118:20 recess [1] - 139:3 recollection [1] - 56:2 recommended [2] -103:25, 104:3 record [14] - 7:1, 28:24, 29:1, 29:11, 31:6, 56:1, 70:6, 98:5, 101:6, 106:6, 107:14, 117:9, 118:18, 119:8 **RECORD** [2] - 1:1, 1:13 Record [3] - 1:21, 140:10, 140:14 records [13] - 30:3, 31:7, 31:8, 73:6, 73:8, 73:9, 73:12, 73:13, 74:2, 105:7, 119:2, 119:5 recover [8] - 50:2, 50:6, 50:8, 53:24, 54:3, 54:5, 59:9, 116:13 recovery [6] - 106:15, 106:16, 106:17,

106:22, 107:9,

107:13

recycling [1] - 133:12 Reese's [5] - 19:20, 19:23, 19:24 refer [1] - 85:12 reference [1] - 138:8 referring [3] - 118:23, 122:3, 137:6 refers [1] - 137:15 reflect [2] - 98:22, 104:14 reflected [1] - 30:6 reflects [1] - 140:14 regard [2] - 45:2, 130:21 regarded [1] - 29:24 regarding [1] - 35:2 regulation [1] - 65:5 regulations [8] -20:25, 64:5, 64:16, 64:21, 86:10, 86:23, 87:2, 91:18 reintroduce [1] -52:11 related [1] - 62:13 relating [5] - 24:12, 102:6, 109:10, 109:12, 113:11 relationship [6] -65:19, 69:17, 69:19, 70:10, 72:2, 82:7 release [24] - 36:1, 40:18, 41:7, 41:8, 41:17, 42:2, 42:6, 45:13, 46:6, 56:7, 56:17, 83:3, 83:4, 125:19, 125:20, 130:17, 131:19, 132:1, 132:5, 132:8, 132:9, 132:19, 137:10 released [3] - 40:4, 47:1, 135:18 releases [5] - 32:22, 36:24, 37:4, 46:10 releasing [4] - 27:22, 42:7, 51:16, 56:22 relies [1] - 136:25 rely [3] - 133:2, 134:3, 135:19 relying [1] - 135:11 remain [1] - 101:2 remained [5] - 40:24, 41:3, 46:7, 51:11, 134:10 remains [1] - 132:17 remediating [2] -110:19, 120:7 remediation [8] - 9:10. 9:20, 59:21, 60:18, 110:12, 113:19,

119:17, 119:23 remedies [1] - 60:7 remember [21] -47:10, 49:15, 60:3. 61:14, 64:10, 65:1, 67:22, 68:11, 68:13, 88:22, 89:20, 94:24, 110:4, 112:18, 125:7, 125:8, 125:9, 125:21, 130:4, 130:9, 130:10 remind [6] - 18:2, 19:3, 49:3, 102:3, 130:1, 130:2 reminded [1] - 21:20 reminder [3] - 16:10, 35:24, 43:24 removal [4] - 9:9, 23:3, 93:7, 119:16 remove [3] - 20:16, 49:14, 63:3 removed [1] - 93:17 render [4] - 17:24, 18:25, 73:23, 95:6 repaired [2] - 22:21, 23:15 repairs [1] - 24:18 repeat [2] - 87:9, 130:23 repeated [1] - 120:6 repeatedly [1] -122:21 report [2] - 47:5, 47:13 reported [2] - 1:21, 140:12 **Reporter** [2] - 140:3, 140:22 Reporter's [3] - 1:21, 140:9, 140:13 REPORTER'S [2] -1:1, 1:13 represent [2] - 11:25, 52:12 representative [12] -12:14, 21:2, 21:4, 71:2, 71:3, 76:5, 85:20, 86:2, 86:11, 115:1, 133:7 representatives [2] -24:16, 45:1 represented [1] -134:11 representing [1] -115:2 represents [2] - 12:20, 52:14 reputable [3] - 62:7, 63:10, 72:10 requested [1] - 140:8 require [3] - 18:6,

19:7, 24:2 rise [3] - 96:14, 100:6, required [13] - 9:11, 100:24 20:22, 53:10, 59:23, 64:6, 86:6, 87:15, 91:15, 91:17, 91:24, 92:12, 95:12 requirement [8] -48:24, 61:5, 61:6, 61:10, 63:25, 70:18, 72:5, 113:3 requirements [2] -48:4, 68:16 requires [1] - 40:17 research [1] - 75:6 resolved [1] - 30:11 respect [11] - 35:1, 35:10, 35:15, 35:19, 87:16, 95:13, 96:20, 109:9, 116:9, 128:1, 135:6 respects [3] - 20:24, 64:13, 123:8 response [5] - 22:1, 23:18, 27:3, 118:19, 118:20 responsibilities [1] -111:3 responsibility [3] -43:22, 69:5, 82:14 responsible [13] -15:6, 32:12, 32:21, 42:4, 72:25, 79:6, 79:23, 81:16, 83:13, 110:9, 120:3, 130:14, 134:19 responsibly [1] -65:15 rest [3] - 16:15, 55:7, 99:4 rests [2] - 137:20, 138:14 result [13] - 9:12, 10:1, 15:6, 22:8, 22:12, 24:24, 24:25, 27:9, 28:7, 38:18, 40:3, 46:10, 70:8 resulted [1] - 45:9 resuspending [1] -128:4 revealed [1] - 79:2 revenue [2] - 9:22, 37:8 revenues [1] - 37:10 review [1] - 82:18 reviewed [2] - 80:14, 102:20 revoke [1] - 129:4

Rice [1] - 44:16

riding [1] - 67:3

rights [1] - 125:3

River [56] - 13:24, 15:7, 17:25, 18:21, 19:1, 21:21, 23:1, 24:22, 26:6, 26:12, 26:18, 27:1, 27:7, 27:22, 29:13, 30:13, 30:24, 31:17, 32:4, 33:3, 34:14, 36:25, 38:4, 38:15, 40:5, 40:25, 42:18, 42:21, 45:12, 45:18, 45:20, 46:7, 47:1, 51:17, 56:23, 73:19, 73:24, 74:5, 77:14, 79:24, 89:9, 90:14, 94:2, 94:10, 95:8, 95:21, 100:17, 101:15, 107:19, 108:4, 109:6, 118:13, 127:20, 128:1, 136:7, 137:7 river [22] - 14:1, 14:13, 15:5, 16:21, 16:23, 16:24, 17:8, 17:17, 18:5, 19:6, 21:25, 23:7, 24:4, 27:13, 39:17, 42:21, 77:9, 81:1, 94:4, 94:6, 94:7, 97:17 Rivette [3] - 133:7, 133:8, 133:13 road [3] - 96:16, 112:7 roads [1] - 80:5 roadway [1] - 47:9 Roberts [2] - 122:13, 122:14 robin [1] - 114:20 **ROBIN** [1] - 3:8 **rOCK** [1] - 2:14 Rock [3] - 12:15, 80:19, 130:3 roderick [1] - 24:15 role [1] - 130:19 room [5] - 6:15, 6:22, 7:13, 7:16, 93:13 **Root** [1] - 91:8 **ROSS**[1] - 3:11 rough [1] - 123:20 roughly [1] - 21:18 **ruby** [1] - 97:4 rules [7] - 57:3, 59:12, 62:5, 62:7, 63:22, 63:24, 64:15 rulings [1] - 22:12 run [10] - 90:2, 93:13, 100:6, 100:25, 101:13, 101:17, 103:14, 104:5,

107:7, 124:22 running [1] - 88:10 runoff [1] - 101:18 runoffs [1] - 77:8 runs [1] - 38:22 Ryan [2] - 12:2, 12:18 RYAN [1] - 2:11 S

sad [1] - 16:10 safety [1] - 20:25 sale [1] - 33:25 sales [1] - 29:25 San [60] - 11:13, 13:24, 15:7, 17:2, 17:25, 18:21, 19:1, 21:16, 21:21, 23:1, 24:22, 26:6, 26:11, 26:17, 27:1, 27:7, 27:22, 29:13, 30:13, 30:24, 31:17, 32:4, 33:3, 34:14, 36:25, 38:4, 38:15, 40:5, 40:25, 41:7, 42:18, 42:21, 45:11, 45:18, 45:19, 46:7, 47:1, 51:16, 56:23, 73:19, 73:24, 74:4, 77:13, 77:14, 79:24, 90:14, 94:2, 94:10, 95:8, 95:21, 100:16, 101:15, 107:19, 108:4, 109:6, 118:12, 127:20, 127:25, 136:6, 137:6 sand [18] - 24:23, 80:4, 80:6, 80:24, 81:16, 95:2, 108:9, 108:10, 108:15, 108:16, 122:16, 123:19, 123:21, 124:2, 127:19, 128:8, 131:5 sandwich [3] - 19:17, 19:18 satisfactory [3] -74:13, 92:23, 93:4 satisfying [1] - 93:6 saw [6] - 94:24, 94:25, 111:18, 130:2, 130:4, 135:12 **say..** [1] - 129:3 scene [3] - 60:3, 130:25, 136:5 school [1] - 86:20 **SCHRADER** [1] - 3:19 science [1] - 79:22 scoot [1] - 19:9

screen [6] - 50:23,

51:5, 51:9, 51:12, 55:16, 104:7 screening [1] - 79:3 screens [1] - 55:14 scroll [1] - 25:5 scrolling [1] - 24:9 sea [1] - 107:23 seat [4] - 64:24, 65:2, 65:4, 65:7 seated [3] - 5:4, 55:10, 84:23 second [7] - 18:1, 57:11, 62:14, 64:9, 73:5, 88:18, 135:4 seconded [1] - 30:9 Secord [1] - 52:13 SECORD [1] - 2:21 section [2] - 75:10, 92:7 secure [1] - 95:4 sediment [1] - 127:24 sediments [1] - 128:3 see [73] - 6:19, 8:4, 8:8, 11:16, 14:2, 14:11, 16:18, 16:19, 16:21, 22:11, 23:22, 25:8, 29:3, 45:15, 45:17, 50:18, 50:22, 50:23, 51:6, 51:8, 51:12, 57:21, 63:16, 63:19, 69:8, 69:24, 70:3. 73:7. 73:9. 74:25. 81:10. 81:21. 83:12, 83:16, 87:6, 89:5, 89:11, 89:13, 91:4, 92:15, 92:17, 93:15, 93:23, 94:4, 94:5, 95:20, 99:14, 100:11, 104:6, 105:6, 107:7, 107:25, 108:3, 108:13, 108:14, 108:19, 109:21, 115:19, 117:15, 118:2, 123:19, 124:25, 125:5, 126:1, 127:17, 129:16, 129:19, 131:4, 137:12, 137:13, 139:1 seeing [1] - 114:23 seek [1] - 77:25 seeking [8] - 91:5, 105:23, 106:1, 106:8, 107:4, 120:9, 121:9, 127:13

seeks [1] - 77:23

seem [1] - 104:4

seepage [5] - 17:24,

19:1, 25:22, 73:24,

95:7 select [1] - 6:16 selecting [2] - 9:13, 115:24 sell [3] - 33:13, 33:18, 33:20 selling [3] - 33:21, 34:21, 36:4 send [3] - 6:22, 7:15, 20:17 sensitive [4] - 22:4, 25:11, 25:15, 26:20 sent [5] - 6:14, 28:5, 28:6, 95:16, 124:1 separate [10] - 9:17, 37:18, 60:21, 61:3, 109:25, 110:5, 113:14, 119:24, 130:16, 134:11 separated [1] - 96:9 September [5] - 63:11, 99:7, 99:18, 99:19, 102:4 serious [1] - 138:10 seriously [1] - 135:1 serve [2] - 29:20, 114:9 service [2] - 51:24, 138:20 services [1] - 12:12 serving [1] - 55:1 set [9] - 10:23, 37:20, 74:20, 98:19, 106:6, 106:14, 106:25, 107:13, 135:9 sets [2] - 16:15, 35:25 settle [1] - 96:13 settled [1] - 100:5 several [4] - 59:25, 74:22, 87:8, 95:14 shape [6] - 112:12, 116:1, 119:6, 131:16, 131:22, 136:24 share [2] - 114:17, 115:3 shareholders [3] -31:3, 34:10, 105:8 **shares** [5] - 104:25, 105:9, 105:10, 116:24, 135:7 **sheet** [2] - 30:6, 123:5 **sheriff's** [1] - 66:25 sheriffs [1] - 60:3 shifting [1] - 33:11 short [1] - 53:8 **shortened** [1] - 85:13 shortly [6] - 21:11, 21:13, 38:21, 44:9, 59:1, 115:8

show [35] - 14:1, 14:4, 18:9, 18:14, 28:7, 37:6, 39:11, 42:15, 50:16, 55:14, 59:2, 69:9, 81:22, 83:16, 84:3, 94:16, 95:18, 96:12. 98:19. 101:10. 101:14. 102:6, 103:19, 103:20, 106:7, 107:1, 107:14, 110:24, 118:8, 123:14, 126:13, 129:7, 132:7, 132:9, 135:5 showed [7] - 26:5, 42:11, 70:14, 73:15, 103:17, 119:5, 130:13 showing [9] - 31:8, 47:13, 63:12, 63:13, 75:1, 109:16, 109:18, 118:8 shown [2] - 62:10, 104:15 shows [4] - 24:22, 33:1, 63:16, 122:23 shut [1] - 111:21 side [8] - 13:21, 39:17, 96:11, 100:3, 100:23, 101:1, 101:18 sides [6] - 17:23, 18:24, 73:22, 95:5, 95:23, 131:12 sign [6] - 112:4, 112:10, 112:14, 112:16, 112:22, 113:8 signed [2] - 34:8, 93:16 significant [2] - 29:7, 29:8 significantly [1] -64:14 signing [1] - 8:10 signs [1] - 129:20 silent [2] - 40:24, 41:3 silently [1] - 40:4 silt [1] - 24:23 similar [3] - 22:15, 22:16, 66:20 simply [4] - 8:7, 9:1, 82:7, 135:20 single [4] - 72:19, 82:21, 83:2, 83:5 sinister [5] - 104:1, 104:5, 104:7,

104:23, 105:11

Sipocz [3] - 81:12,

130:12 sister [1] - 115:9 sit [3] - 7:11, 7:12, 51:24 site [165] - 9:7, 9:8, 9:10, 9:13, 9:20, 10:3, 10:5, 11:8, 11:9, 11:12, 11:14, 11:16, 20:3, 20:17, 20:21, 25:1, 25:22, 26:6, 27:7, 27:24, 28:3, 28:6, 28:18, 29:20, 29:22, 30:13, 30:15, 30:19, 30:20, 30:21, 31:11, 31:12, 31:20, 35:17, 38:20, 39:15, 39:23, 39:24, 41:15, 41:22, 42:16, 42:20, 45:11, 47:7, 47:9, 47:11, 50:15, 50:19, 51:7, 56:15, 57:8, 59:21, 60:16, 60:18, 60:19, 61:19, 62:19, 62:23, 63:4, 63:6, 63:13, 63:15, 63:17, 63:20, 63:21, 64:8, 65:18, 66:4, 69:1, 69:2, 69:5, 71:5, 71:8, 71:11, 71:14, 72:8, 72:15, 72:16, 72:18, 72:21, 73:2, 73:11, 75:16, 76:8, 77:14, 80:17, 81:8, 81:17, 81:20, 81:21, 81:23, 83:6, 83:8, 83:9, 87:4, 87:10, 93:25, 94:5, 94:16, 94:18, 94:23, 95:14, 95:17, 96:3, 98:7, 99:20, 99:21, 99:22, 99:25, 102:7, 103:4, 103:5, 103:21, 103:24, 104:16, 104:19, 105:15, 105:16, 105:19, 107:25, 108:23, 109:17, 109:19, 109:22, 110:11, 110:12, 110:20, 110:24, 110:25, 111:20, 113:16, 113:19, 115:25, 116:3, 116:5, 117:17, 118:5, 118:13, 118:18, 119:17, 120:8, 121:6, 122:2, 123:7, 125:10, 125:18, 125:25, 126:1, 128:10, 131:9, 133:22,

135:7, 135:20, 137:15 sites [1] - 121:7 sitting [3] - 7:22, 57:1, 80:19 situation [7] - 58:13, 112:4, 120:10, 127:6, 129:18, 133:19, 138:10 **six** [1] - 75:6 size [1] - 91:9 sketch [6] - 10:19, 10:20, 13:23, 45:5, 48:5, 51:21 skilled [1] - 72:11 sky [1] - 131:6 **skyscraper** [1] - 89:8 slide [3] - 81:9, 124:16, 128:20 slipping [1] - 93:1 sludge [66] - 13:24, 14:14, 14:18, 14:22, 14:25, 15:2, 15:4, 15:8, 15:19, 16:6, 17:17, 20:5, 20:17, 20:21, 23:20, 23:23, 24:2, 24:3, 24:13, 25:2, 27:24, 27:25, 28:5, 30:25, 31:13, 31:16, 32:10, 32:14, 32:16, 33:1, 33:2, 33:7, 36:2, 38:3, 38:11, 39:16, 39:21, 40:1, 40:23, 41:3, 41:17, 42:14, 43:6, 43:7, 43:8, 43:11, 43:13, 43:15, 44:12, 44:17, 47:17, 50:24, 51:15, 90:20, 91:6, 92:21, 93:8, 93:11, 93:17, 99:13, 99:16, 99:23, 100:4, 100:10, 109:5 **small** [1] - 97:15 smooth [1] - 129:17 soil [1] - 123:18 **sold** [3] - 37:8, 105:12, 108:16 **sole** [2] - 7:23, 39:8 **soliciting** [1] - 124:6 **Solid** [8] - 48:2, 48:19, 65:12, 65:24, 66:5, 68:11, 68:12, 69:11 solid [2] - 48:21, 68:17 solidify [2] - 101:4, 101:11 solution [2] - 58:12, 62:1 someone [7] - 59:16, 66:13, 66:15, 68:25,

70:21, 72:11, 85:15 **sometime** [1] - 50:25 sometimes [6] - 6:20, 6:21, 8:1, 25:6, 55:12 someway [1] - 118:6 somewhere [1] - 97:1 son [2] - 98:24, 104:9 sonny [1] - 88:23 soon [1] - 20:9 sophisticated [2] -101:23, 102:18 sorry [1] - 108:14 sort [9] - 60:2, 87:12, 91:2, 106:10, 133:17, 134:7, 135:20, 136:10, 137:4 sought [1] - 92:13 source [3] - 78:8, 79:22, 109:5 sources [7] - 73:7, 76:17, 76:25, 77:13, 78:6, 79:20, 130:16 Southwest [1] - 59:24 space [1] - 88:18 speaking [1] - 58:14 special [10] - 12:17, 22:5, 25:12, 25:16, 26:21, 69:15, 69:16, 69:19, 70:9, 70:10 specific [22] - 16:3, 20:18, 46:20, 58:18, 58:20, 60:11, 60:13, 61:1, 63:10, 65:14, 67:17, 67:20, 68:8, 70:11, 72:2, 78:9, 79:4, 79:18, 82:2, 83:4 specifically [3] -46:14, 94:15, 135:21 specification [1] -62:25 specificity [1] - 78:15 **specifies** [1] - 18:15 speed [3] - 67:7, 67:8, 112:11 speeding [6] - 60:6, 60:10, 60:15, 67:1, 67:5 spent [3] - 11:2, 106:9, 107:11 **Spill** [7] - 48:2, 49:12, 65:11, 65:24, 65:25, 66:6, 67:24 spill [1] - 49:14 spite [2] - 127:6, 128:22 **splits** [1] - 53:9 spoil [6] - 17:20,

18:15, 18:20, 23:2, 73:17, 73:18 sponsor [1] - 53:18 spread [2] - 89:15, 99:4 spreading [1] - 128:3 sprinkle [1] - 110:15 stage [2] - 16:15, 35:25 stand [19] - 11:1, 44:5, 45:4, 46:5, 46:23, 49:8, 50:10, 52:13, 72:25, 85:17, 90:18, 94:25, 103:6, 107:15, 110:14, 111:14, 111:23, 112:2, 114:4 standard [1] - 65:9 standards [1] - 65:10 standing [1] - 110:16 **standpoint** [1] - 55:12 stands [1] - 47:23 **STANFIELD** [1] - 3:18 Stanley [1] - 111:19 star [1] - 131:7 start [6] - 55:13, 84:20, 91:12, 103:14, 138:23, 139:2 started [7] - 21:15, 31:20, 56:16, 96:15, 99:16, 99:21, 102:4 starting [9] - 21:11, 21:18, 45:10, 51:6, 55:13, 65:22, 89:14, 92:10, 122:14 starts [1] - 38:13 state [20] - 11:23, 25:20, 38:14, 40:10, 40:17, 52:18, 53:3, 59:11, 62:4, 86:24, 92:9, 102:21, 106:16, 109:18, 110:22, 111:18, 111:20, 118:9, 124:7, 126:7 State [17] - 9:22, 9:24, 12:19, 12:20, 15:14, 15:21, 40:15, 43:20, 44:2, 48:9, 48:23, 48:25, 53:12, 53:24, 98:12, 105:22, 140:5 **STATE** [3] - 1:4, 2:17, 140:1 STATEMENT [4] -52:5, 55:19, 85:1, 114:12 statement [10] - 5:20, 32:6, 56:19, 57:20, 59:3, 74:10, 80:18,

85:8, 124:19, 127:9 STATEMENTS [1] -10:12 statements [9] - 5:9, 5:21. 9:5. 10:10. 35:6, 55:7, 58:16, 109:4 **states** [6] - 26:23, 26:24, 48:7, 48:20, 57:9. 71:17 **STATION** [1] - 2:19 station [1] - 115:10 status [1] - 29:18 statute [15] - 10:7, 48:18, 49:11, 53:10, 53:23, 60:12, 60:13, 61:1, 67:5, 67:17, 67:23, 68:8, 77:19, 77:20 statutes [31] - 9:16, 47:25, 48:3, 50:22, 51:4, 51:19, 58:18, 58:20, 58:21, 58:23, 59:3, 59:5, 65:14, 65:21, 66:4, 66:18, 70:11, 70:12, 72:2, 82:2, 82:10, 82:18, 82:20, 83:4, 84:4, 110:6, 113:14, 120:24, 120:25, 121:1, 121:3 statutory [1] - 49:25 stayed [1] - 31:16 stenotype [1] - 1:21 step [2] - 64:5, 111:2 stepped [1] - 98:4 sticker [2] - 113:2, 113:4 still [6] - 51:2, 51:9, 97:2, 97:3, 105:13 stipulation [7] - 9:1, 10:8, 14:16, 32:5, 53:6, 110:14, 120:11 stipulations [2] - 5:8, 8:25 stock [15] - 36:15, 36:22, 37:3, 41:11, 98:18, 98:21, 98:22, 98:23, 99:1, 99:4, 105:2, 105:4, 105:12 stockholders [1] -105:3 stood [1] - 114:17 stop [22] - 15:4, 24:3, 41:17, 59:15, 59:16, 65:2. 68:21. 68:22. 69:16, 69:18, 70:20, 70:21, 72:3, 82:10, 112:4, 112:10, 112:14, 112:16,

112:22, 113:8, 122:9, 122:10 stopped [9] - 36:24, 37:4, 60:4, 60:5, 60:6, 68:6, 115:8, 116:3, 132:19 **stopping** [1] - 112:22 **stops** [1] - 67:1 stored [1] - 93:12 stories [1] - 89:7 **storing** [2] - 74:3, 92:20 storm [1] - 77:8 storms [1] - 26:1 **story** [2] - 39:5, 86:15 straight [3] - 106:6, 107:1, 107:14 **STRAWN** [1] - 4:5 **stream** [1] - 82:8 **Street** [3] - 112:9, 112:16 STREET [3] - 2:5, 3:15, 4:6 stretches [1] - 138:15 striping [1] - 108:14 strong [1] - 123:20 strongly [1] - 138:16 studied [2] - 74:22, 79:2 studies [1] - 39:20 Study [10] - 32:20, 33:7, 33:9, 33:10, 78:17, 78:18, 78:25, 79:2, 79:12 study [7] - 32:10, 32:18, 32:25, 33:8, 79:3, 79:11, 79:12 stuff [1] - 87:9 styled [1] - 140:10 subcontractors [1] -20:23 subject [3] - 21:1, 25:25, 40:2 submerged [2] -24:21, 45:11 submit [2] - 116:19, 117:9 **submitted** [1] - 6:3 subsequent [1] -24:16 **subsidence** [3] - 81:4, 81:7, 108:6 subsidiaries [2] -133:15, 133:19 subsidiary [2] - 118:6, 119:24 subsidiary's [1] -134:20 substance [13] - 10:1, 15:8, 32:7, 38:17,

125:21, 132:1, 132:10 substances [1] -49:15 substantial [1] -108:19 sucks [1] - 123:19 **sudden** [1] - 65:2 **sue** [2] - 36:20, 72:21 sued [2] - 83:1, 116:8 suffer [13] - 15:13, 15:20, 24:1, 44:1, 48:8, 48:20, 68:17, 68:20, 68:25, 69:14, 70:15, 70:17, 125:22 suffered [3] - 40:11, 41:6, 43:18 suffering [1] - 40:14 sufficient [1] - 23:19 suggest [1] - 115:23 suggests [1] - 127:19 suing [3] - 48:1, 48:19, 113:14 suit [6] - 9:7, 53:3, 75:21, 75:24, 83:19, 111:24 **suitable** [1] - 93:22 **SUITE** [2] - 3:6, 3:15 sum [4] - 29:7, 29:8, 30:5. 34:4 **summary** [3] - 53:14, 53:20, 85:8 **superfund** [1] - 9:18 Superfund [12] - 9:8, 9:14, 10:3, 10:5, 38:20, 40:16, 58:13, 59:19, 60:22, 62:2, 77:18, 82:25 superintendent [1] -23:10 support [1] - 134:15 supposed [3] - 10:18, 39:13, 93:22 supposedly [1] -132:15 **Supremes** [1] - 90:8 surprise [1] - 79:14 surprising [2] - 58:25, 59:1 surrounded [3] -75:17, 96:7, 123:8 surrounding [1] -108:24 surveyor's [2] - 47:5, 47:13 suspect [1] - 52:21 suspected [1] - 128:9

49:16, 51:10,

109:23, 113:21,

116:14, 125:19,

**suspend** [2] - 129:5, 129:11 **Sydney** [1] - 114:21 **SYDNEY** [1] - 3:10 **system** [5] - 7:20, 91:19, 97:17, 103:12, 135:8

# Т

table [1] - 54:2 tale [1] - 129:19 talks [3] - 25:24, 25:25, 95:22 tall [1] - 89:13 tallest [1] - 89:8 task [1] - 86:12 tax [3] - 103:21, 103:22, 104:3 TCEQ [16] - 53:8, 53:11, 53:24, 54:3, 54:8, 118:3, 118:17, 118:19, 118:23, 127:12, 127:17, 127:24, 128:6, 128:10, 128:13, 128:17 TCEQ's [1] - 128:23 technical [1] - 55:12 technology [4] - 7:6, 7:7, 64:25, 78:13 telephone [2] - 24:15, 73:25 televised [1] - 88:24 tell-tale [1] - 129:19 ten [1] - 55:6 ten-minute [1] - 55:6 tendency [1] - 8:3 tendered [1] - 140:15 tens [2] - 27:25, 32:17 term [1] - 134:4 terminated [2] - 69:6, 102:7 terms [5] - 15:12, 20:18, 21:6, 132:18 Terry [1] - 12:17 testified [1] - 131:15 testify [4] - 85:20, 94:25, 107:2, 129:19 testifying [2] - 70:24, 71:1 testimony [15] - 44:8, 58:1, 70:23, 72:24, 74:17, 75:18, 76:4, 76:6, 76:17, 81:19, 99:15, 126:17, 129:22, 131:2, 132:21 testing [1] - 78:22

Texan [1] - 96:24

**TEXAS** [14] - 1:4, 1:5, 1:5, 1:11, 2:6, 2:12, 2:17, 2:18, 2:19, 3:4, 3:6, 3:16, 4:6, 140:1 Texas [89] - 1:20. 9:15, 9:22, 9:24, 10:7, 12:19, 12:21, 15:6, 15:11, 15:15, 15:21, 36:18, 37:2, 37:12, 37:14, 37:18, 38:14, 40:15, 41:21, 42:6, 43:20, 43:25, 44:2, 44:22, 48:1, 48:2, 48:7, 48:9, 48:19, 48:23, 49:1, 49:12, 49:24, 50:1, 51:18, 52:12, 52:15, 52:17, 52:19, 53:1, 53:12, 53:24, 70:13, 81:13, 86:20, 87:2, 89:4, 90:3, 97:1, 97:2, 97:18, 98:12, 105:18, 105:22, 113:14, 114:25, 115:14, 115:23, 116:3, 116:7, 116:23, 117:11, 117:16, 119:19, 119:25, 120:3, 120:4, 120:13, 127:16, 128:11, 128:17, 130:9, 130:12, 130:24, 132:23, 133:6, 133:9, 133:15, 134:17, 134:19, 135:1, 135:6, 136:4, 140:5, 140:21, 140:23, 140:24 texture [1] - 100:21 that.. [1] - 130:14 THE [27] - 1:4, 1:4, 2:3, 2:11, 2:17, 2:18, 3:4, 3:14, 5:4, 5:12, 8:21, 8:22, 22:9, 52:1, 52:9, 55:4, 55:10, 55:22, 84:17, 84:23, 85:4, 114:10, 114:14, 123:1, 138:21, 140:1 themselves [2] -28:19, 29:6 thereafter [2] - 47:15, 115:8 therefor [1] - 35:7 they've [2] - 107:11, 127:18 thick [1] - 75:1 thinks [2] - 39:10, 54:18

third [5] - 27:20, 124:14, 124:15, 125:20 Thompson [1] -111:19 thoroughly [1] - 122:7 thousand [3] - 16:2, 49:4, 121:10 thousands [2] - 27:25, 32:17 threat [1] - 48:22 threatened [2] - 35:3, 136:11 three [19] - 12:9, 17:13, 27:17, 28:4, 28:6, 28:8, 47:14, 47:25, 48:2, 109:25, 110:5, 113:14, 121:1, 121:3, 121:4, 128:15, 128:16, 129:1, 129:5 throughout [2] - 58:8, 85:13 thumbnail [4] - 10:18, 10:20, 13:23, 51:21 ticket [12] - 60:5, 60:10, 60:15, 67:4, 67:5, 67:10, 67:18, 112:21, 112:23, 113:1, 113:5 tides [2] - 46:25, 47:21 tied [1] - 104:15 timeline [10] - 16:25, 37:20, 38:13, 63:15, 73:4, 73:6, 109:20, 117:19, 125:8, 130:22 timelines [1] - 117:20 tires [1] - 112:11 title [6] - 31:3, 31:6, 68:16, 70:6, 92:6, 98:5 today [14] - 12:1, 12:10, 12:11, 65:6, 65:8, 65:9, 75:12, 85:15, 89:13, 94:25, 112:21, 120:5, 130:1, 134:12 together [12] - 6:1, 11:3, 13:3, 24:10, 28:25, 29:1, 49:19, 49:20, 86:15, 87:19, 91:3, 114:21 Tom [1] - 34:2 Tony [1] - 52:11 took [5] - 42:3, 116:22, 118:3, 129:6, 135:2 top [2] - 88:25, 107:10

total [1] - 107:4

touches [1] - 38:8 toward [2] - 21:18, 94.7 **TOWER** [1] - 2:5 toxins [1] - 135:17 traced [1] - 131:9 tract [5] - 16:21, 94:1, 94:8, 98:3, 118:12 traffic [2] - 59:15, 59:16 trained [1] - 75:14 transaction [1] - 41:14 transactions [1] -44:21 transcription [2] -1:22, 140:7 transfer [2] - 98:21 transferred [1] - 98:15 transport [2] - 20:21, 63:4 transported [2] -14:20, 132:16 trash [1] - 133:11 **TRAVIS** [1] - 2:5 treated [1] - 101:25 treatment [1] - 101:22 trees [2] - 69:25, 101:5 TRIAL [1] - 1:2 trial [10] - 1:18, 8:10, 12:14, 52:14, 86:1, 87:5, 87:7, 115:2, 130:1, 130:19 tried [7] - 5:17, 87:21, 96:4, 96:5, 97:23, 112:3, 119:2 **Trot** [1] - 97:1 trucks [1] - 100:15 true [2] - 120:1, 140:6 truly [2] - 37:19, 140:14 trust [4] - 31:5, 118:22, 119:1 Trustee [1] - 98:6 truth [3] - 116:9, 117:14 try [8] - 18:18, 51:23, 64:20, 85:11, 86:14, 117:20, 119:2, 131:18 trying [13] - 19:11, 59:8, 61:15, 67:19, 116:12, 119:7, 120:23, 132:5, 132:9, 132:18, 132:23, 138:14 TSUCHIYAMA [1] -2:8

touch [1] - 13:12

102:2

touched [2] - 37:23,

tune [1] - 130:18 turn [1] - 65:2 turned [4] - 29:12, 62:25, 67:11, 72:12 turns [1] - 67:4 two [33] - 8:25, 13:2, 14:1, 14:4, 14:6, 17:9, 17:18, 18:9, 18:11, 19:15, 20:7, 20:15, 21:7, 22:16, 28:16, 28:17, 30:17, 37:9, 41:18, 50:8, 50:11, 97:5, 105:7, 105:12, 115:7, 125:14, 125:16, 130:15, 134:6, 135:12, 135:13, 135:19, 137:18 type [5] - 65:5, 72:11, 74:17, 79:16, 82:10 types [2] - 11:24, 28:21 typically [1] - 6:18 U

**U.S** [1] - 61:17

ultimate [1] - 9:20

ultimately [4] - 101:5,

126:1, 129:11 umbrella [1] - 105:11 unanimously [1] -30:10 under [30] - 9:15, 15:6, 20:25, 21:22, 23:4, 24:21, 30:23, 35:4, 35:9, 35:14, 44:2, 48:1, 48:19, 53:3, 61:7, 63:22, 70:10, 72:2, 83:4, 84:4, 92:10, 98:11, 105:4, 105:11, 110:5, 119:4, 119:17, 120:24, 121:3, 131:23 understandably [1] -119:9 understood [1] - 83:8 undertake [1] - 49:13 underwater [6] -31:13, 31:25, 47:7, 47:12, 47:14, 47:15 unfortunate [2] -83:21, 86:12 unfortunately [2] -64:13, 66:20 Unit [2] - 17:5, 92:8 **University** [1] - 44:16 unless [1] - 106:22 unusual [1] - 111:10

up [79] - 6:4, 7:10, 7:12, 9:13, 16:4, 16:5, 23:21, 24:8, 25:5, 26:8, 27:9, 27:19, 27:24, 28:14, 33:8, 34:23, 35:23, 44:6, 47:23, 50:6, 50:8. 51:4. 51:13. 52:13, 54:2, 54:4, 54:23, 55:14, 55:15, 59:16, 66:23, 67:1, 74:20, 77:18, 81:4, 84:20, 85:17, 87:13, 89:12, 91:17, 94:12, 94:13, 96:14, 96:18, 97:1, 98:4, 98:19, 100:6, 100:10, 100:18, 100:24, 101:15, 101:21, 101:24, 102:11, 103:10, 104:22, 106:14, 108:10, 110:19, 111:2, 112:15, 112:22, 113:8, 113:15, 114:17, 119:5, 120:8, 120:15, 120:21, 123:4, 123:19, 129:14, 132:24, 135:9, 135:24, 138:8, 139:2 **US** [1] - 9:6

#### V

valuable [1] - 51:22 **value** [2] - 29:25, 30:4 various [3] - 44:25, 73:7, 127:5 vehicle [3] - 67:6, 67:8, 67:16 ventured [1] - 74:6 verdict [1] - 6:18 version [1] - 43:22 viewed [1] - 17:20 Villareal [1] - 66:22 Villareal's [1] - 66:20 Vince [2] - 12:2, 12:18 VINCE [1] - 2:11 violated [7] - 10:7, 40:10, 49:12, 58:19, 59:4, 70:11, 84:3 violating [2] - 50:21, 67:16 violation [6] - 16:8, 51:4, 61:1, 70:16, 77:19, 77:20 violations [4] - 16:14, 49:25, 51:18, 59:13 Virgil [22] - 21:13,

31:3, 31:6, 31:7, 34:9, 97:7, 97:22, 98:2, 98:6, 98:7, 98:10, 98:15, 98:22, 99:24, 103:8, 104:10, 105:8, 108:21, 111:13, 118:21, 119:1, 119:4 visit [2] - 22:2, 114:16 visited [2] - 21:19, 95:14 **voir** [6] - 5:16, 13:10, 52:11, 53:1, 61:13, 114:16 **VOLUME** [2] - 1:1 volume [1] - 140:9 voted [3] - 28:18, 39:14, 103:20

#### W

wagon [1] - 115:10 wait [3] - 32:25, 43:5, 111:12 waiting [1] - 7:17 walk [3] - 15:2, 39:15, 50:14 walked [1] - 52:22 walking [1] - 39:16 walks [1] - 67:11 Walters [2] - 54:9, 54:15 wants [6] - 61:25, 64:19, 72:1, 72:21, 78:3, 134:7 warn [3] - 14:24, 35:21, 41:23 warned [1] - 17:4 WASHINGTON [1] -3:22 Waste [56] - 13:5, 13:9, 13:15, 13:19, 28:10, 28:11, 36:16, 36:18, 37:1, 37:2, 37:12, 37:14, 37:18, 41:20, 41:21, 42:6, 43:3, 44:21, 48:2, 48:19, 49:24, 65:12, 65:24, 66:5, 68:11, 68:12, 69:11, 114:25, 115:13, 115:23, 116:3, 116:7, 116:22, 117:11, 117:16, 118:1, 118:4, 118:7, 119:6, 119:19, 119:24, 120:2, 120:4, 120:12, 121:17, 130:24, 132:23, 133:6,

133:9, 133:14, 134:9, 134:17, 134:18, 135:1, 135:5, 136:4 waste [108] - 11:10, 13:24, 13:25, 14:13, 14:14, 17:2, 17:3, 17:6. 17:7. 18:3. 18:4, 19:3, 19:5, 21:1, 21:16, 21:19, 21:22, 21:24, 22:6, 23:2, 23:6, 24:13, 25:1, 25:13, 25:17, 25:21, 26:22, 28:18, 29:15, 29:19, 30:19, 30:24, 32:4, 33:24, 34:15, 39:14, 39:18, 39:20, 40:3, 40:22, 40:24, 40:25, 42:18, 45:8, 48:10, 48:21, 49:2, 51:10, 56:14, 62:6, 62:7, 62:8, 62:15, 62:19, 64:5, 65:15, 66:13, 66:15, 67:25, 68:18, 69:21, 70:4, 70:5, 70:7, 70:16, 72:17, 74:4, 76:10, 76:20, 76:21, 77:25, 78:2, 78:20, 79:1, 79:23, 82:7, 82:8, 84:10, 85:24, 87:12, 91:5, 91:13, 93:1, 97:25, 98:13, 99:12, 99:19, 104:20, 105:21, 107:17, 107:18, 109:4, 115:24, 116:1, 120:13, 127:19, 127:22, 128:10, 133:17, 135:17, 135:18, 136:7, 136:9, 137:7, 137:9 **WASTE** [4] - 1:10, 1:11, 3:4, 3:4 waste-handling [3] -17:6, 19:3, 21:22 wastepaper [1] -39:21 wastes [2] - 22:21, 23:15 Water [9] - 15:11, 43:25, 48:1, 48:7, 50:1, 70:13, 75:10, 86:20, 92:7 water [24] - 16:8, 32:13, 40:18, 46:25, 47:18, 47:20, 75:17, 77:8, 77:25, 81:1,

96:14, 100:6,

100:12, 100:13, 100:19, 100:24, 101:13, 101:17, 101:19, 101:20, 101:22, 101:24, 128:4 waters [15] - 15:14, 15:21, 24:21, 30:24, 31:16, 40:11, 40:15, 43:19, 44:1, 45:17, 45:19, 48:8, 48:23, 48:25 waved [1] - 114:17 ways [1] - 36:10 week [1] - 99:15 weeks [3] - 11:5, 18:16, 93:24 weight [1] - 7:24 well-stated [1] -134:14 west [8] - 18:21, 23:1, 64:1, 73:19, 89:8, 94:2, 95:20, 100:23 western [2] - 96:10, 101:13 wet [1] - 101:3 white [1] - 7:9 whole [5] - 22:22, 25:6, 25:8, 29:4, 31:22 wild [1] - 64:1 Wildlife [1] - 81:13 wildlife [6] - 127:16. 127:21, 128:11, 128:17, 130:9, 130:13 win [1] - 67:16 wind [2] - 46:25, 47:20 WINN [1] - 3:17 Winn [1] - 64:10 **WINSTON**[1] - 4:5 withstood [2] - 46:25, 47:20 witness [6] - 16:4, 39:5, 54:8, 57:25, 111:11, 138:24 WITNESS [1] - 140:17 witness's [1] - 55:15 witnesses [8] - 7:24, 10:25, 44:5, 44:7, 44:9, 69:4, 83:20,

83:22

89:22

wonder [2] - 89:19,

wonderful [1] - 7:7

word [5] - 14:9, 53:4,

word-for-word [1] -

wood [1] - 78:4

Woody [1] - 88:7

58:21, 104:2

52:1, 53:15, 53:22, 106:7, 124:19 **WOTRING** [5] - 2:4, 2:7, 10:11, 10:13, 22:14 writes [5] - 23:18, 57:11, 67:3, 67:4, 127:16 writing [6] - 30:4, 33:19, 33:23, 36:4, 103:25, 140:8 written [8] - 6:4, 22:24, 36:8, 62:10, 62:14, 67:17, 75:12, 127:24 wrote [2] - 81:13, 103:21 Υ y'all [18] - 64:10, 92:16, 101:14, 104:21, 112:1, 114:16, 114:17, 115:4, 124:22, 134:4, 139:1 Yankees [1] - 90:1 47:23 yards [3] - 28:1, 123:21, 124:2 32:18, 88:21, 103:12, 103:13, 103:15, 103:16, 103:18, 104:6, 104:8, 104:10, 104:13 years [64] - 14:15,

14:9 59:9, 61:23, 64:18, words [3] - 29:21, 65:18, 66:3, 67:22, 58:20, 60:21 67:23, 67:24, 68:13, works [4] - 7:20, 69:11, 76:14, 80:9, 123:15, 128:14, 82:15, 82:16, 82:17, 84:12, 84:13, 86:3, 135:8 world [3] - 88:1, 105:15, 105:17, 107:18, 108:5, 89:20, 89:22 108:18, 108:22, worth [1] - 33:25 109:21, 109:24, worthless [1] - 29:24 110:22, 111:9, worthy [1] - 134:25 111:12, 112:15, Wotring [6] - 10:10, 112:19, 113:10, 114:21, 116:2, 119:15, 128:15, 128:16, 129:1, 129:5, 133:16, 134:21, 136:4 yellow [3] - 108:1, 123:6, 129:16 yesterday [1] - 17:20 you-all [6] - 10:16, 10:21, 14:11, 94:3, 102:4, 104:17 young [1] - 89:18 yourselves [1] - 8:17 Ζ

75:11, 85:7, 85:16, 88:5, 90:16, 91:14, yard [3] - 32:17, 47:22, year [15] - 21:19, 28:1, year-end [1] - 104:10 16:8, 16:9, 16:14, 20:6, 28:16, 28:17, 36:2, 37:9, 38:24, 40:4, 41:5, 41:18, 45:13, 47:1, 49:10, 51:18, 56:7, 58:2,

zealous [1] - 44:6 zero [7] - 40:19, 40:20, 41:9, 42:7 Zoch [1] - 123:11 zone [1] - 67:2